

Title: The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism

Author: Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī ﷺ

Translated by: Muftī Abdullah Moolla

First Edition: Muharram 1442/August 2020

Published by: Dār-ul-‘Ulūm Zakariyya

Lenasia, South Africa

CONTENTS | المحتويات

Foreword: Maulānā Shabbier Ahmed Saloojee	16
Foreword: Maulānā Abdul-Hamīd Ishāq.....	22
Introduction مقدمة	27
Important Guidelines	41
Foreword: Muftī Sa'id Ahmad Pālanpūrī رحمه الله	45
Chapter one	57
Biography of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī	57
Name & Lineage.....	57
Birth	58
Primary Education	58
Youth & Employment	59
Favourable View of the British Government	60
Beginning of the Attack on Islām through the slogan of the truthfulness of Islām	61
Melancholia/hysteria	61
Claims of Mirzā.....	63
Claim of being the Bayt-ullāh	64
Claim of being the Mujaddid (1882 C.E)	64
Claim of Being Ma'mūr (1882 C.E)	64
Claim of being Nadhīr (1882 C.E)	65
Claim of being Ādam, Maryam & Ahmad (1883 C.E)	65
Claim of Risālat (1884 C.E)	66

4 | *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*

Claim of Tauhīd & Tafrīd (1886 C.E).....	66
Claim of Mathīl Masīh (1891 C.E).....	66
Claim of being Masīh Ibn Maryam (1891 C.E)	67
Claim of being ‘the being of Kun fa Yakūn’ (1892 C.E)	67
Claim of being Masīh & Mahdī (1894 C.E)	67
Claim of being Imām-e-Zamān (1898 C.E).....	68
Claim of being a Zillī Nabī (1900 C.E. to 1908 C.E)	68
Claim of Nubuwwat & Risālat	68
Claim of being a Nabī & Rasūl with an Independent Sharī’ah	69
Marriages of Mirzā	72
Children	73
Death	74
First representative.....	75
Second representative	77
Third representative	78
Fourth representative	78
The Lahori sect of Qādiyānīs	79
The interesting reality	81
Chapter Two	83
Specifying the subject matter	83
Scheme of the Qādiyānīs	84
Duty of the Muslim Debater.....	85
Levels of specifying the subject matter	86
Some tried & tested ways of specifying the subject matter	87

5 | *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*

Start of the discussion	87
Second stage.....	90
Third stage.....	92
Summary	94
A possible objection & Reply.....	95
An important principle	96
The following luminaries were accepted as the mujaddid of the first century .	98
The mujaddidīn of the second century	99
The mujaddidīn of the third century.....	100
The mujaddidīn of the fourth century.....	100
The mujaddidīn of the fifth century.....	101
The mujaddidīn of the sixth century	101
The mujaddidīn of the seventh century.....	102
The mujaddidīn of the eighth century	102
The mujaddidīn of the ninth century	103
The mujaddidīn of the tenth century	103
The mujaddidīn of the eleventh century.....	103
The mujaddidīn of the twelfth century	103
The mujaddidīn of the thirteenth century.....	104
Important Note	105
Chapter Three.....	106
The truth & Falsehood of Mirzā.....	106
Beginning of the Discussion.....	106
Statements of Mirzā about lying.....	107

6 | *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*

Falsehood of Mirzā.....	109
First proof of the falsehood of Mirzā.....	109
Second proof of the falsehood of Mirzā.....	110
Third proof of the falsehood of Mirzā.....	110
Fourth proof of the falsehood of Mirzā.....	111
Lies upon lies.....	113
Fifth proof of the falsehood of Mirzā.....	118
Useless attempt.....	120
The interpretation of the Mirzā'is is wrong & useless for a number of reasons	121
An important principle.....	122
Sixth proof of the falsehood of Mirzā.....	123
Seventh proof of the falsehood of Mirzā.....	125
The Intelligent One.....	125
Eighth proof of the falsehood of Mirzā.....	127
Ninth proof of the falsehood of Mirzā.....	128
Tenth proof of the falsehood of Mirzā.....	129
Another angle of the falsehood of Mirzā.....	130
The teachings of Mirzā in terms of character & conduct.....	130
A few examples of the foul language of Mirzā.....	132
Take note.....	136
Another angle of the falsehood of Mirzā: False Prophecies.....	137
Plot of the Mirzā'is.....	138
First False Prophecy.....	141

7 | *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*

An ashamed cat claws at the lamppost	143
Another ruse	146
A tit for tat response	147
Second false prophecy	147
The cunning & false speech of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī	149
Prophecy of Līkhrām	149
Third false prophecy.....	151
Fourth false prophecy.....	152
Fifth false prophecy.....	153
Sixth false prophecy	156
Perplexity of the Mirzā'īs.....	158
Seventh false prophecy	159
Critique.....	160
Eighth false prophecy.....	162
Ninth false prophecy	164
Glad tidings of Ghulām Halīm	164
Tenth false prophecy: Qādiyān will remain protected from the Plague	165
Confession that the prophecies were wrong & false: from the pen of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.....	167
Fourth angle of the falsehood of Mirzā: Poetry	169
Consternation of the Mirzā'īs	170
Fifth angle of the falsehood of Mirzā: The revelation & Inspirations of Mirzā in different languages	172
A pointless endeavour	173

8 | *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*

Sixth angle of the falsehood of Mirzā: Final Decision with Maulānā Thanā-ullāh Amritsarī	175
Divine Decree	176
Interpretation of the Mirzā'īs	177
Feebleness of the interpretation	177
Death of Mirzā from Cholera	178
Admirable magic	180
Feeble excuse	180
Subhānallāh.....	181
Divine Mercy	182
Single truth of his life	182
Mirzā seeks Mubāhalah	183
Mubāhala between Maulānā 'Abdul-Haq Ghaznawī & Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī	183
Final decision with Maulānā Thanā-ullāh Amritsarī	184
Invitation to Mubāhalah of Mirza & His repentance.....	185
Letter of repentance	186
Mirzā Tāhir calls for Mubāhalah & Response of Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī	187
Repentance of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad	188
What is Mubāhalah?	192
Challenge of Mirzā Tāhir is accepted.....	193
Mirzā Tāhir admits defeat	194
Conclusion	199

9 | *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*

Analysis of the proofs showing the truthfulness of Mirzā	200
Mirzā Qādiyānī treats his wives in conflict with the Shari'ah	210
Second Proof.....	214
Mirzā'ī Excuse	218
Third Proof.....	220
Mirzā'ī Excuse	222
Difference between Nisf & Wast.....	223
An important rule	225
Chapter Four	229
The ascension and descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ	229
Clarifying the topic	230
Introduction 1: Announcement of the Noble Qur'ān	233
Confession of Mirza Qādiyānī.....	233
Introduction 2: Mirzā'ī Principle	234
Method of Extrapolation.....	234
Objections from Mirza Qādiyānī.....	238
The power of Allāh ﷻ	239
Summary.....	243
Proof of ascension and descent from the verses of the Noble Qur'ān	244
First Proof.....	244
Second proof.....	245
Confusion of the Mirzā'is	246
Analysis.....	250
Third proof.....	254

10 | *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*

Fourth proof	255
Method of extrapolation	255
Qādiyānī Plot	256
Fifth proof	257
Irritation of Mirzā Qādiyānī	259
Reason for the sequence of the verses	262
Second reason	263
Research of the word ‘Tawaffā’	264
The challenge of Mirzā Qādiyānī	265
Response	267
Challenge to the Qādiyānīs	269
Our challenge	269
Sixth proof	270
Feeble interpretations of the Mirzā’īs of the verses	271
First excuse	271
Second objection of the Mirzā’īs	273
Silencing response	273
Effort without result	275
Summary	279
Third objection of the Mirzā’īs	280
Another interpretation	281
Definition of ‘Istikhdām’	281
Another important point	282
Fourth Mirzā’ī interpretation	282

11 | *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*

Fifth objection	285
Strike the knee and expect the eye to burst.....	285
Challenge	286
Final arrow of the quiver	287
Seventh proof.....	290
Eighth proof	290
Mirzā'ī objection	293
Ninth proof.....	294
Tenth proof.....	295
Method of extrapolation	295
Eleventh proof	298
Twelfth proof.....	298
Clearing a doubt.....	299
Second Discussion: proof of ascension & descent from the Ahādīth.....	300
Confusion of the Mirzā'īs	301
Mirzā'ī Objection.....	307
Our challenge	310
Qādiyānī Challenge	311
Interesting reference.....	311
Features of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ	314
Reconciliation of the Narrations	315
Proof of ascension & descent from the consensus of the ummah.....	317
Refutation of the Mirzā'ī proofs from the Qur'ān on the demise of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ	320

12 | *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*

Mirzā'ī Extrapolation.....	321
Response	322
The matter is about word; not knowledge.....	325
Bitter times	328
Second proof.....	334
Extrapolation	334
Objection to the Answer	335
Claim of ijma' of the Ummah of the demise of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ.....	337
Method of extrapolation	344
Method of extrapolation	348
Refutation of the Mirzā'ī proofs from the Ahādīth.....	349
Condition of the Mirzā'īs	355
Chapter Five	356
Khatm-e-Nubuwwat	356
Clarifying the topic	356
An important note	360
Introduction to Khatm-e-Nubuwwat	362
A few excuses of the Mirzā'īs and the replies.....	368
The belief of Khatm-e-Nubuwwat in the light of the Qur'ān.....	370
The tricks of Mirzā Mahmūd	372
The height of ignorance	372
The translation of Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn from Rasūlullāh ﷺ	374
The Translation of Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn from Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī	374

13 | *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*

Confusion of the Mirzā'īs	375
The meaning of khātam-un-Nabiyyīn; Seal of the Messengers.....	376
The baseless interpretation of Mirzā.....	376
The Mirzā'īs should check their own house	378
does the descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ negate Khatm-e-Nubuwwat?	380
Translation of the text of Kash-shāf.....	383
Is Rasūlullāh ﷺ the seal of only the previous Ambiyā'?	383
What specialty remains?	384
Is the Alif-Lām on Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn 'ahdī or istighrāqī?.....	384
Response	385
Is saying Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn the same like saying Khātam-ul-Mufasssīrīn & similar titles?	385
We seek the protection of Allāh.....	386
The prey came out of your shield	387
What happened when the lie did not work?.....	388
Note	391
Reasons for similarity	392
Dismissal of a Mirzā'ī doubt	394
An important note	401
Ahādith on Khatm-e-Nubuwwat	402
Flabbergasted	403
Dismissal of a Doubt.....	408
The decisions of the 'Ulamā' of the Ummah on Khatm-e-Nubuwwat.....	410
Post mortem of the Mirzā'īs proofs	412

14 | *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*

First proof.....	412
Interpretation of the poem.....	416
Analysis of the interpretation	417
Challenge	422
Second proof.....	422
Answers	422
Third proof	424
Method of extrapolation	424
Responses.....	425
The height of obstinacy.....	438
Complete lies	441
Deception.....	442
First reason	442
Second reason	443
Fourth proof.....	443
Response	444
Nubuwwat is Wahabī; not kasbī (Confession of Mirza Qādiyānī)	445
Is Nubuwwat Wahabī or Kasbī?.....	446
Objections upon ‘there is no Nabī after me’	448
Objections upon the word ‘Khātam’ & the replies	454
Brief answer to the statements of the pious.....	458
Difference between Nabī & Rasūl	460
Difference between Nabī & Ummatī.....	460
Reasons for the Kufr of the Qadiyānīs.....	462

15 | *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*

First Reason: Claim of Nubuwwat by Mirzā.....	463
Second reason: denial of the birth of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ without a father	465
Third reason: denial of the ascension and descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ	466
Fourth reason: insolence towards Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ & Sayyidah Maryam ﷺ.....	467
Fifth reason: insolence towards the rest of the Ambiyā’, including Rasūlullāh ﷺ.....	469
Sixth reason: denial of the miracles of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ	472
Seventh Reason: denial of the obligation of Jihād	473
Eighth Reason: Takfir of all Muslims	475
Conclusion خاتمة	477
Suggested Reading	478
Websites.....	480
Translator’s Note.....	481



**FOREWORD: MAULĀNĀ SHABBIER AHMED
SALOOJEE**

نحمده ونصلي على رسوله الكريم

All praise is for Allāh ﷻ, the Creator and Sustainer of the universe. May peace and salutations be upon our noble leader and master, Sayyidunā Muhammad Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

Allāh ﷻ says in the Noble Qur’ān,

﴿ مَا كَانَ مُحَمَّدٌ أَبَا أَحَدٍ مِّن رِّجَالِكُمْ وَلَكِن رَّسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِيِّينَ ۚ وَكَانَ اللَّهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلِيمًا ۝ ﴾ (الأحزاب: ٤٠)

Muhammad ﷺ is not the father of any of you, but He is the Rasūl and the seal of the Ambiyā’, and Allāh has knowledge of everythingⁱ

In Abū Dāwūd and Tirmidhī, Sayyidunā Thaubān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ reports that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said,

سيكون في أمتي ثلاثون كذابون كلهم يزعم أنه نبي، وأنا خاتم النبيين لا نبي بعدي. ترمذي

“There will be thirty liars in my Ummah, all of them will claim to be a Nabī, whereas I am the seal of the

ⁱ Sūrah Al-Ahzāb: 40

Ambiyā', there is no Nabī after me."

The unanimous belief (*'aqīdah*) of the *Ahl-us-Sunnah wal Jamā'ah* is that our Nabī, Sayyidunā Muhammad Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the final Nabī. He is the seal of all the Ambiyā' ﷺ. No Nabī will come after Rasūlullāh ﷺ until the Day of *Qiyāmah*.

Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ - who is alive in the heavens - will come for some time to the world and will rule in accordance to the Noble Qur'ān and Sunnah. The belief (*'aqīdah*) of the finality of *Nubuwwat*, i.e. *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* is an integral part of *īmān*.

In the time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, there were some who claimed *Nubuwwat* like Aswad Anasī and Musaylamah. After the time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, there were some who claimed *Nubuwwat* directly or through the line of *Imāmat*. These Imāms were given the status of *Nubuwwat* or a rank supposedly even higher than *Nubuwwat*.

The '*Ulamā'* have always made the Muslim Ummah aware of these imposters and agents of Shaytān. In India also, in the late 1800s, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad of Qādiyān appeared on the scene. In 1880 he claimed to be a Mahdī. In 1882, he claimed to be a Mujaddid. From 1891, he claimed to be the promised Masīh, i.e. 'Īsā ﷺ and from 1901 he claimed to be a Nabī.

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, the imposter and false claimant of *Nubuwwat* was backed by the colonial British oppressors. It was during the time when the British desired to wipe out Islām. The British killed thousands of ‘*Ulamā*’. It is reported that an ‘*ālim*’ was found hanged on every tree between Delhi to Lahore.

The great ‘*Ulamā*’ of the time had declared *Jihād* against the British. In 1857, the ‘*Ulamā*’ waged *Jihād* against the British whose goal was the eradication of Islām and rule and loot the Sub-Continent. During this *Jihād*, the father of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī aided the British in order to prove his allegiance and loyalty to them.

The agent of the British, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, issued a verdict that *Jihād* against the British is *Harām* (forbidden). He also said, “Disobedience to Allāh ﷻ and Rasūlullāh ﷺ causes the ‘*arsh* (divine throne) to shake. In the same way, through disobedience to Queen Elizabeth, the ‘*arsh* also shakes.”

In 1952, a movement was spearheaded by Sayyed ‘Atā-ullāh Shāh Bukhārī ﷺ for the protection of the belief of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*. Thousands of lives were sacrificed for this cause.

There are too many lies and fabrications of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī to mention in this foreword. Some of these have been discussed in detail by the

illustrious author of this book.

When the British left India in 1947, they left the Qādiyānīs in a very influential political position. Zafrullāh Khan was the first Foreign Minister of Pakistan. He used the foreign embassies to spread Qādiyānism. Their aim was to turn Pakistan into a Qādiyānī State. The great sacrifice of the ‘*Ulamā*’ ensured that this did not happen.

In 1974, Mirzā Nāsir, grandson of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was called to Parliament by Bhutto to argue the case of the Qādiyānīs. The debate was extensive and discussed the beliefs and character traits of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. The debate lasted for twenty-one parliamentary days. Thirteen days were taken by the Qādiyānīs. The case of the *Ahl-us-Sunnah wal Jamā’ah* was presented by Muftī Mahmūd ﷺ and Maulānā Ghulām Ghauth ﷺ. After this debate, the Qādiyānīs were unanimously declared as disbelievers (*kāfir*). The entire debate can be seen on the website of Khatm-e-Nubuwwat Academy, London.

There are two groups of the followers of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. They are: Lahori and Qādiyānī. They are brothers of each other and have nothing to do with the pristine religion of Islām.

The Lahori group superficially claims that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is only a *Mujaddid* (whereas

to regard anyone who claims *Nubuwwat* in any sense of the word as a Muslim, let alone a *Mujaddid* will render a person out of the fold of Islām).

The Qādiyānī group openly states that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is a Nabī. Both of these groups are out of the fold of Islām and have no share in Islām at all.

Shahīd-e-Islām Maulānā Muhammad Yūsuf Ludhiyānwī ﷺ says, “There were two crimes of Mirzā. The first was that he made claims of *Nubuwwat* and invented a new religion. He called this religion ‘Islām’.

The second crime was that he declared the religion brought by Sayyidunā Muhammad Rasūlullāh ﷺ to be disbelief (*kufr*). The followers of Mirzā Qādiyānī have been declared as Muslims and those who believe in Sayyidunā Muhammad Rasūlullāh ﷺ have been declared by him as disbelievers (*kuffār*)!”

Tell me, has any Jew, Christian, Hindu, Sikh or Magian perpetrated this crime? From this one can understand how evil and debased the disbelief of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī actually is. He is in fact, worse than the other disbelievers of the world.

In this book, *The Golden Maxims in Refutation of Qādiyānism*, Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad Chinioti ﷺ has exposed both of these groups. He discusses the claims of this imposter and false claimant of *Nubuwwat* in great

detail. He has highlighted the fallacious arguments of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and showed how he misleads the Muslim Ummah.

The *fitnah* of Qādiyānism is covered in this work over five chapters with a beautiful introduction explaining how the work should be studied. May Allāh ﷻ reward the author for his great effort and accept these services in the defence of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*.

It was the desire of Maulānā ﷺ that this humble servant translate this book into English. Alhamdullāh, the English translation was done by Muftī Abdullāh Moolla, an Ustād at Madrasah Arabia Islamia, Dār-ul-‘Ulūm Azaadville. May Allāh ﷻ reward him for this noble effort for the protection of the ‘*aqidah* of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*.

May Allāh ﷻ raise us on the Day of *Qiyāmah* in the company of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr Siddīq ﷺ, the first guardian and protector of the ‘*aqidah* of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*. Amīn

(Maulānā) Shabbier Ahmed Saloojee
Dar-ul-‘Ulūm Zakariyya
Yaum-ul-Ahad/Sunday
13 Dhul-Qa’dah 1441/6 July 2020



FOREWORD: MAULĀNĀ ABDUL-HAMĪD
ISHĀQ

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

حامدا ومصليا ومسلما

All Praises, Honour and Grandeur are only for Allāh ﷻ, Whose favours and blessings are innumerable and continuously pouring down upon us. We continually praise and thank Him for all His favours and *ni'mats* (bounties); for concealing our faults and sins and forgiving them; for protecting us and keeping us safe, despite our disobedience and numerous and frequent sins!

We praise and thank Him for sending the Ambiyā' ﷺ; the first of whom is Ādam ﷺ and the final and last Nabī, Sayyidunā Muhammad ﷺ, who is the Seal of all the Ambiyā' ﷺ!

Continuous and innumerable *Salāt* and *Salām* upon His most honourable and greatest Nabī, Nabī Muhammad ﷺ; after whom there is no Nabī, forever!

Salāt and *Salām* on our master and king, Muhammad ﷺ, who made the greatest efforts for the true and final

Dīn, Dīn-ul-Islām, to be established perfectly and permanently in the world; that there would be no need, in any way, for another Nabī!

Our Rasūl ﷺ is *Khātām-ur-Rusul* (the final Messenger and seal of all the Messengers) and *Rahmatul-lil-‘ālamīn* (A Great Mercy for the entire universe).

A non-Muslim once objected: *“Your Nabī cannot be both the Seal of the Messengers and a Mercy to the entire universe, at the same time. It is through the door of Risālat and Nubuwwat by which Allāh ﷻ’s Mercy descends and spreads in the world. When he is the seal of the Ambiyā’, and no Nabī will come after him, he has effectively closed this mercy of Allāh ﷻ. Therefore, he cannot be a mercy for all mankind. If he is a Mercy for the universe, then for Allāh ﷻ’s Mercy to continue to descend and spread in the world, he cannot be Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn (the seal of all the Messengers). As such, he cannot be both Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn and Rahmatul-lil- ‘ālamīn.”*

The answer to this, which our respected ‘Ulamā’ give, is: *Our Nabī Muhammad ﷺ is definitely the seal of the Ambiyā’ and Rusul. Yes, the door of Nubuwwat and Risālat has been completely closed forever, by the coming of our Nabī ﷺ, so there can be no Qādiyānī or anyone to claim to be a Nabī after him. However, the work of Nubuwwat and Risālat will continue, at all times, and by virtue of this work, Allāh ﷻ’s Mercy will continue to*

descend and flow.

The entire *Ummah*, especially the ‘*Ulamā*’, have been made responsible for the continuous effort to establish, preserve and propagate the true *Dīn*. In this, the Mercy of Allāh ﷻ, which descends through the door of *Nubuwwat* and *Risālat* will, in fact, be intensified and widespread in the entire world, until *Qiyāmah*! The *Sahābah* ﷺ and our *Aslāf* (pious predecessors) are a living testimony to this fact. The great ‘*Ulamā*’, *Auliya*’ and all who are working within the limits of *Dīn* and *Sharī’ah*, are, till this day, making efforts in this noble direction!

The hard fact and ‘*aqīdah*’ (belief) of the finality of *Nubuwwat* of Muhammadur Rasūlullāh ﷺ, is a fundamental, integral part of our *Dīn* and ‘*aqā’id*’ (beliefs); without which a person cannot be a Muslim! Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and many others falsely laid claim to *Nubuwwat* and *Risālat*. Not only did Mirzā Ghulām Ahmād Qādiyānī claim to be a Nabī, he made other contemptable, blasphemous and outrageous assertions, which included slandering the Ambiyā’ ﷺ – *Na-uzu Billāh*.

This great and magnificent book, *Radd-e-Qadianiat ke Zarri Usul*, *Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad Chinioti* ﷺ, is, in fact, a compilation of his academic lectures in Darul Ulūm Deoband in 1990, by Maulana Salmān

Mansūrpūrī *dāmat barakātuhu* of Moradabad. This book is really an encyclopaedia for those who are concerned and have hope to guide the Qādiyānīs to the true and correct beliefs, thereby saving them from the fire of Jahannam! The study of this book is a must for those who come into contact with Qādiyānīs. Through the details given, one will be in a better position to explain to them their wrong beliefs and at the same time, protect oneself from their completely false and baseless beliefs. Of course, in interacting with them, one has to be very cautious, alert and guarded; so as not to get caught up in their falsehood. May Allāh ﷻ safeguard us all.

Alhamdulillah, Mufti Abdullah Moolla *dāmat barakātuhum* has done a superb piece of work in the English translation and a great favour upon the Ummah; fulfilling a great need, whereby those who are conversant with English and do not know Urdu, can benefit tremendously. They can understand what this terrible *fitnah* is about; how to save themselves and others from those wrong beliefs, which lead one into Jahannam. May Allāh ﷻ protect us all! *Āmīn! Āmīn! Āmīn!*

Māshā-Allāh, Dar-ul-Ulūm Zakariyya has undertaken this noble and valuable service of *Dīn*, to have this very important and essential book translated into English. May Allāh ﷻ accept all their excellent services to *Dīn*,

make them most beneficial for all and crown all their efforts with acceptance.

May Allāh ﷻ fully reward Maulana Shabbier Saloojee *dāmat barakātuhu*, the principal of Dar-ul-Ulūm Zakariyya, who bade me, though I am not worthy of it at all, to write a foreword as well; whose orders are an honour for me to follow... especially this order, whereby I have been granted the honour to have a share in this great service of *Dīn*. May Allāh ﷻ make it a means to earn the pleasure and happiness of *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn*, *Rahmatul-lil-‘Ālamīn* ﷻ.

May Allāh ﷻ make this book most beneficial; make it a means of *Hidāyah* (guidance) for everyone forever and let everyone understand and follow the True *Dīn*. May Allāh ﷻ be pleased with us all, fully accept it from us all; make it a storage for our *ākhirah* and for our salvation in this world and the *ākhirah*. *Āmīn, thumma Āmīn!!!*

(Maulānā) ‘Abdul Hamid Ishāq
Azaadville
26 Shawwāl 1441/19 June 2020

INTRODUCTION |





THE *fitnah* of the false *Nubuwwat* of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is very terrible one of the fourteenth (*hijrī*) century. It was planted by the English for their sinister objectives and malefic ambitions. Then, it spread its tentacles with the support of the English. The scholars of Islām started to respond to him (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) during his lifetime and as long as this *fitnah* remains in the world, the servants of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* will continue dealing with it and responding to it *Inshā Allāh*.

It was first the ‘*Ulamā*’ of Ludhiyana (may Allāh shower them with abundant mercy) that declared Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī as a disbeliever (*kāfir*). As his disbelief became clearer and apparent to all, scholars that were previously in doubt about his disbelief, also unanimously issued *fatwā* of *kufṛ* on him and supported the ‘*Ulamā*’ of Ludhiyana. Among the outstanding ‘*Ulamā*’ that refuted Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī in every way during his lifetime were: Maulānā Muhammad ‘Ālam Āsī, Dr ‘Abdul-Hakīm Patyālwi,

Maulānā Thanā-ullāh Amritsarī, Maulānā Sa'd-ullāh Ludhiyānwī, Maulānā Karamdī, Maulānā 'Abdul Haq Ghaznawī, Pīr Muhr 'Alī Shah Golrawī and Hāfiz Muhammad Shafī'.

After the disgraceful death of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, when this *fitnah* took on the form of an organization and sect, then Allāh ﷻ turned the attention of 'Allāmah Anwar Shah Kashmīrī ﷺ, Shaykh-ul-Hadīth of Dār-ul-'Ulūm Deoband, in its direction. Together with dealing with it in terms of knowledge and the sciences, he worked with a group to face and deal with this *fitnah* and pledged allegiance at the hands of Sayyed 'Atā-ullāh Shah Bukhārī ﷺ, and appointed him as the *Amīr-e-Sharī'at*. His entire group stood up to face the *fitnah*. He prepared his students in the field of debate.

They were: Maulānā Murtadā Hasan Chāndpūrī ﷺ, Maulānā Muhammad Badr-e-'Ālam Mīrthī Muhājir Madanī ﷺ, Muftī Muhammad Shafī' ﷺ, Maulānā Muhammad Idrīs Kandehlawi ﷺ and Maulānā Yūsuf Binnorī ﷺ. Similarly, the poet of the East - Dr Muhammad Iqbal - and Maulānā Zafar 'Alī Khan readied themselves to deal with this *fitnah*. The father of Dr Muhammad Iqbal, Nūr Muhammad was first a friend of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, but he later on disassociated from him. Dr Muhammad Iqbal was also initially affected by this movement, but whenever

‘Allāmah Anwar Shah Kashmīrī  would come to Lahore, he would reside at the home of Dr Muhammad Iqbal and he clarified the disbelief and misguidance of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī fully to Dr Muhammad Iqbal. Today, whatever work is taking place in the world in the line of refuting Qādiyānism, it is all through the munificence of ‘Allāmah Anwar Shah Kashmīrī .

In 1947, after Hindustan was freed from the clutches of the English and the country was divided, Pakistan became a separate country, the Qādiyānīs had to leave Qādiyān, which was their abode of safety, and had to come to Pakistan. At the banks of the Chenab River, they settled themselves in a vast plain, forming a town and deceptively, they called it Rabwah.ⁱ

ⁱ From a historical perspective, Rabwah is from where Muhammad Ibn Qasim, after conquering Sindh and Multan, crossed the Chenab River and moved towards Kashmir. Here the Arabs fought against the Hindu Raja of Chandrod (which is probably the ancient name of Chiniot). Before the establishment of Rabwah, the area was barren and was known as Chak Digiyaan. The land was leased by the Ahmadiyyah Muslim Community following the migration of most of its members from Qadian and other parts of Indian Punjab, to newly created Pakistan. In June 1948, 1034 acres of land were leased from the government for PKR 12,000. The town was named Rabwah by then leader of the Ahmadiyyah Muslim Community, Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd Ahmad. Rabwah is an Arabic word meaning an "elevated place". The formal inauguration of the settlement took place on 20 September 1948 after prayers and a

Maulānā Muhammad Hayāt رحمہ اللہ was appointed by Amīr-e-Sharī'at Sayyed 'Atā-ullāh Shah Bukhārī رحمہ اللہ to head the office in Qadiyān to deal with the Qādiyānīs. He also came to Pakistan. Amīr-e-Sharī'at Sayyed 'Atā-ullāh Shah Bukhārī رحمہ اللہ set up Madrasah Tahaffuz Khatm-e-Nubuwwat in Multan. The graduates of this institution were taught a special course in refutation of Qādiyānism. The teacher of the course was Maulānā Muhammad Hayāt رحمہ اللہ.

I enrolled at Madrasah Tahaffuz Khatm-e-Nubuwwat, Multan in 1951 and was trained and nurtured there.

sacrifice of five goats at the corners and centre of the area. The place where Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd Ahmad led first ever prayers became the first ever mosque of Rabwah, the Yadgaar (memorial) Mosque. The first settlements were in camps which were later replaced by buildings constructed of mud. The first ever building constructed using concrete was the Mahmūd Mosque. Electricity was provisioned to the city in 1954.

Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd Ahmad relocated to Rabwah on 19th of Sept 1949. By that time the population had reached 1,000. The first ever Jalsa Salana in Rabwah took place from 15 to 17 April 1949, attended by 17,000 people.

The Punjab Assembly passed a resolution on 17 November 1998 changing the name of Rabwah to 'Nawan Qadian', but on 14 February 1999, a new directive was issued, renaming Nawan Qadian to Chenab Nagar. The other names considered were Chak Dhaggian, Mustafa Abad, and Siddiq Abad.

Maulānā Muhammad Hayāt ﷺ prepared and trained Maulānā Muhammad Chirāgh (who was also a special student of ‘Allāmah Anwar Shah Kashmīrī ﷺ) in the field of refutation of Qādiyānism. He subsequently spent his life in dealing with this *fitnah* and refuting it.

Our teacher used to say, ‘I was studying *Mishkāt* and *Jalālayn* when the first *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* conference was held in Qadiyān in 1934. My teacher, Maulānā Muhammad Chirāgh and I participated in this historic conference. We bought two sets of the Qādiyānī books from there and departed to Gujranwala. We began studying the books. I left my formal education and with my teacher, we began to debate with the Qādiyānīs. I then dedicated the rest of my life to refuting this *Dajjālī fitnah*. The specialty of my teacher was that he used to mostly refute them on what was accepted in their circles, from the books and writings that were accepted by the Qādiyānīs. He stipulated laws and principles for debate that caught the opposition in such a way that it was practically impossible for them to come out of his clutches. They had no option but to attest their defeat and flee.’

After completing my training, I began teaching the books of *Dīn*. Together with this; I started to train the students in the field of refutation of Qādiyānism. Our city, Chiniot, neighbours the headquarters of Qādiyānism. Therefore, I felt the responsibility even

more.

This new headquarters of the Qādiyānīs was established in 1948, on the western banks of the Chenab River close to Chiniot. This area was very cunningly and deceptively named ‘Rabwah’, from a word of the Noble Qur’ān (Sūrah Al-Mu’minūn, verse 50, that was interpolated. This word is mentioned regarding Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ and his pure mother,

‘We made the son of Maryam ﷺ and his mother a sign and gave them a shelter on a high ground, a place of peace and streams were flowing there’. Rabwah is not the name of a city, but it refers to Palestine, which is located on a high ground. Now, they fled from Qadiyan, their ‘*Dār-ul-Amān*’ and came here, set up this town and called it Rabwah so that the future generations will understand from the word of the Noble Qur’ān ‘Rabwah’ that it refers to this particular Rabwah. The word is the same, but they changed the specific point of reference and address. This is a very dangerous form of interpolation (*tabrīf*). Through this interpolation, the future generations will be led astray, as they will not be aware of this new turn of events.

In order to protect this word of the Noble Qur’ān, which was used in a place where it was not intended to be used, the people must be protected from this dangerous deviation. Approximately thirty (30) years

ago, Allāh ﷻ placed the thought in my heart that this name should be changed. Subsequently, after struggling for thirty (30) years, Allāh ﷻ blessed us with success and we got news in our lifetime that on 17 November 1998, the Provincial Assembly of Punjab changed the name ‘Rabwah’. The details of this can be studied in our book, *Qadiyan se Chenab Nagar Tak*.

Chiniot is situated on the eastern banks of the Chenab River. The town of the Qādiyānīs lies on the western banks. Therefore, due to this close proximity, I had to fulfill the rights of the neighbour. Together with teaching, I also fulfilled the obligation of refuting Qādiyānism. I started lecturing, writing, debating and challenging them. In addition, I continued training the students.

Our noble and affectionate teacher, ‘Allāmah Sayyed Muhammad Yūsuf Binnorī ﷺ would train the students in the field of refutation of Qādiyānism during the holiday period after the Madrasah was set up in Karachi. He ﷺ used to call myself and ‘Allāmah Dost Muhammad Qurayshī ﷺ for training in refutation of Qādiyānism and Shiasm. The notes and references that I wrote from the lessons of Maulānā Muhammad Hayāt ﷺ became a detailed work. I used to select parts from it and explain them. Similarly, I was given duties at the *Tanzīm Ahl-us-Sunnah* office in Multan, where students would come to ‘Allāmah Dost Muhammad Qurayshī ﷺ

and Maulānā Tonswī ﷺ for training in refutation of Shiasm, they were given training in the refutation of Qādiyānism too. Every year, I would write important and necessary notes and slowly a book was prepared. These notes were then copied and given to the students who participated in the course. This was done to save writing time and simplify things. In this way, a course of four (4) to six (6) months could be completed in ten (10) to fifteen (15) days.

In 1965, I got the opportunity to travel to Bangladesh for the first time. In a single day, three *Madāris* of Dhaka were covered; Lāl Bagh Madrasah, Jāmi'ah Furqāniyyah Ashraf-ul-'Ulūm and Imdād-ul-'Ulūm Faridabad. The students and '*Ulamā*' were trained in this field. The senior teachers of Hadīth like Muftī Muhiyy-ud-Dīn and Maulānā Muizz-ud-Dīn also participated in the course. In the same way, I travelled to Europe and Africa from time to time. In 1993, I taught for the last time at Jāmi'ah Husayniyyah Dhaka, the Madrasah set up by Maulānā Shams-ud-Dīn Qāsimī. From 1970 to 1975, I would teach the students of Madinah University in Masjid-un-Nabawī from Maghrib to Esha. Through this, the notes were translated into Arabic. Then, in 1985, I was officially called to prepare and train the students of Madinah University. I had the good fortune of preparing and training students from all over the world from after Asr

until Maghrib. I had completed the entire course within eight to ten days.




In 1990, a training course was set up by Dār-ul-‘Ulūm Deoband. ‘*Ulamā*, teachers and lecturers from very province of Hindustan were called. The students and teachers of the Dār-ul-‘Ulūm also took part. The number of participants were about one and a half thousand. I sent my prepared notes to the principal so that copies could be made according to the need. However, the number of participants was huge and the cost of copying was expensive, so an inferior type of copy was made; about two thousand copies were required. When the course was completed, all the participants wrote an official examination. All those who were successful were given certificates in the *Dār-ul-Hadīth* after a *Jalsa* was held. The representatives from the different provinces gave their comments and impressions before the certificates were issued. The principal also gave me an honorary certificate, which was a great honour.

When I was leaving for Pakistan, then Muftī Sa’īd Ahmad Palanpurī and Qārī Muhammad ‘Uthmān (son-in-law of Maulānā Husayn Ahmad Madanī ﷺ) insisted upon me that if I permit, these notes should be published in book form. I was in doubt, as these were only notes that I had prepared. It would be necessary to teach and explain them. After it is published, people

will not see the need to acquire training. Each one will feel that there is a book in refutation of Qādiyānism and that by reading the book, the work will be done. However, they insisted that despite these obstacles, the printed book will prove to be very beneficial for the students and the ‘*Ulamā*’. Looking at their insistence, I gave them permission and I advised them regarding the sequence and layout. This work was subsequently given to Muftī Sayyed Sulaymān Mansūrpūrī, the grandson of Maulānā Husayn Ahmad Madanī رحمہ اللہ. He had participated in the course as well. Muftī Sayyed Sulaymān Mansūrpūrī is a young, reliable scholar, teacher and author. He gathered the notes in book form according to my instructions. He sent the manuscript to me for editing. I studied it and gave further instructions and then returned it to him. The work of approximately two hundred and fifty (250) pages was published as ‘*Radd e Mirzā’iyyat ke Zarri Usūl*’.

After this, friends from Pakistan and other ‘*Ulamā*’, especially ‘Allāmah Khālid Mahmūd رحمہ اللہ of Manchester and Maulānā ‘Abdul Hafīz Makkī رحمہ اللہ, impressed upon me to add to the book and publish it. They also said that it should be translated into other languages and be sent out to all areas because this work will prove to be a very beneficial and strong weapon in the field of refuting Qādiyānism. This work covers all their famous doubts and incorrect notions with a refutation of them,

based on logic and the narrated texts. Thereafter, the method of speaking and discussing with them has been explained. However, it is my view that it is necessary and will prove beneficial if a person acquires understanding and training in this field. Anyway, I studied the manuscript a second and third time and wherever I felt necessary, I made additions and corrections. After this, I studied ‘*Chirāgh e Hidāyat*’ of my teacher a second time and pointed out certain additions to be made to this edition from it. Maulānā Mushtāq Ahmad was responsible to make the additions that I pointed out. Under his supervision, Malik Tāriq Jawed, a student in the specialization course, copied the texts for addition in this work. After this was done, they gave the book to me.

I took the book with me on my journey to England because I would not get the time to complete this type of work at home. I would get the opportunity to do this when on journey. The work of adding to the text was completed in England. Now, during this journey, I presented the manuscript to ‘Allāmah Khālīd Mahmūd . I had taken a special journey to Manchester for this. I did this because I did not feel it appropriate to publish the book until it did not pass the critical eye of ‘Allāmah Khālīd Mahmūd  and he did not give corrections and necessary changes. He holds an authoritative position in this field. May Allāh  reward

him well. He took out time from his many engagements and read the entire manuscript. He made appropriate changes and gave beneficial counsel. Upon my request he wrote a lengthy and beneficial foreword.ⁱ

The foreword of ‘Allāmah Khālid Mahmūd ﷺ is a work on its own. In his special way, he presented the biography and deeds of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and explained that let alone such a person being a Masīh, a Mahdī and a Mujaddid, he asked, is he even worthy of being called a noble human being? In essence, the discussion with the Qādiyānīs should only be on this topic, that in the light of his writings, can the person whom you refer to as the shadow of Sayyidunā Muhammad Mustafā ﷺ, Muhammad the Second, in fact more lofty and virtuous than the first Muhammad ﷺ, we seek the protection of Allāh, and those who do not believe in him to be disbelievers, dwellers of hell and the progeny of prostitutes be truthful, high-minded and a noble human being? The Mirzā’īs will be ready to drink poison, they will tolerate every form of disgrace, but they will never be prepared to speak on this topic. Their distinguishing sign is to speak about the life of Masīh and *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*, whilst from within, their objective is to try and bring people within the fold

ⁱ This foreword has been left out in this English Translation for sake of brevity - Translator

and circle of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. What is food for thought is that the person who they invite to, why do they not speak about his life, character and actions? They know very well that in the light of his writings, he will turn out to be a great liar, fraud, deceit, lewd and drunk adulterer.

This book comprises of five (5) chapters. In the first chapter, the reader is introduced to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and his claims. The second chapter covers the field of discussion and debate, stipulation of topics and sequence of discussions if one has to debate with the Qādiyānīs. The third chapter covers the deceit and lies of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. The fourth chapter discusses the ascension and return of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. This chapter opens up the reasons behind the view and stance of the Muslims of the ascension and return of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. Our view in this matter is different from that of the Qādiyānīs. I have also covered the doubts that they use to create evil thoughts on the topic in the minds of the Muslims. In this chapter, my audience is not primarily the Qādiyānīs, as chapter three (3) deals with the lies on this topic. In chapter five (5), I have discussed the proofs of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*. I have responded to any criticisms and issues made on them by the Qādiyānīs. The book ends off with a conclusion.

In this book I have discussed the topics of the life of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ and *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* in great detail

and I have ripped open the veil of deceit and lies and I have responded to and completely broken the doubts that are raised. However, the main point and discussion that has been proven from narrated and logical proof is the character and deeds of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Only this topic must be discussed in front of the masses.

I have also mentioned a number of proofs showing the lies, deceit and connivance of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. ‘Allāmah Khālīd Mahmūd ﷺ has covered this in his special way in his foreword. The readers will find that some references are repeated. However, it is beneficial and one reference will be found in another place presented from a different angle. This will bring joy to the readers.


‘Allāmah Khālīd Mahmūd ﷺ wrote the name of the book as ‘*Mutāla’ah Qādiyāniyyat ke Zarrī Usūl*’ instead of ‘*Radd-e-Qādiyāniyyat ke Zarrī Usūl*’. Additions have also been made to the first edition.



IMPORTANT GUIDELINES

IF you want to destroy this heretical movement (Qādiyānism), then you will have to study this book more than once. You will have to memorize the principles, laws and references. You should never start any discussion or debate with the Qādiyānī without first specifying the topic and deciding the necessary conditions. Use the weapons given here with full reliance and trust on them and then see their strength. No matter how bold the opposition might be in front of you, he will not be able to breathe and make an impacting move. He will have no option but to flee.

Firstly, the Qādiyānī will not have the courage to accept the proposed topic and conditions. He will flee. Even if he does accept, he will be disgraced in front of the masses.

These principles are the result of many years of experience. This is because our noble teacher, Maulānā Muhammad Hayāt  spent his entire life using them and presented the results and summary of his experiences in front of us. I have put together approximately fifty (50) years of experience in this work before you. In addition, the research of half a century has been included in the foreword. This has come by means of the various discussions and debates of

‘Allāmah Khālīd Mahmūd ﷺ. Each of the discussions is backed up by references. Now, the more effort you make on it, the more results you will get.

All praise is for Allāh ﷻ, in this work, you will get all the discussions that will help you to face the onslaught of Qādiyānism. This is a basic introduction to the historic work that Allāh ﷻ has accepted from us at the end of the twentieth century.

Secondly, one will be able to fully benefit from this work when one studies it under me or under one of the students I have trained. This is because there is a lengthy explanation behind every discussion and most references. When explaining and teaching, I explain my experiences and different incidents that have occurred in my life. In order to enlighten the students, I explain some of the debates that I had. These experiences are not in the book; they are related to practical work and are explained to the students.

Thirdly, now that there are no open debates and discussions with the Qādiyānīs in Pakistan, with the help of Allāh ﷻ, our friends that want to deal with this *fitnah* should take each Qādiyānī on an individual level and try to bring him under his influence and try as best as possible with full sincerity to bring him into the fold of Islām. These valuable people have been snatched by the English from this *Ummah*; therefore, it is the responsibility of each of us to bring them once again

into Islām. This book will prove to be like a computer for those who make effort in this field. Whichever button you press, you will find a fountain of truth that will gush forth in front of you. The day is not far away when this movement of the denial of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* will be stopped in its tracks and will be placed alongside those movements in history that have no followers today.

Fourthly, it is necessary for those making an effort in this field to study the works listed at the end of this book. They should not suffice on this book only. This book covers the well-known questions and refutes the famous doubts. There are many topics not covered here.

It is my duty to show gratitude to all those who have helped in any way to bring this book to completion. Special gratitude is extended to the *Ustādh* of Hadīth at Dār-ul-‘Ulūm Deoband, Muftī Sa’id Ahmad Pālanpūrī رحمہ اللہ. I am grateful to him for his foreword to the work.

I am extremely grateful to Qārī Muhammad ‘Uthmān, who made great effort to bring the work into book form for the first edition. Then, I am grateful to Maulānā ‘Abdul Hafīz Makkī رحمہ اللہ and ‘Allāmah Khālīd Mahmūd رحمہ اللہ, both of whom made beneficial additions and made effort in order to improve the book. ‘Allāmah Khālīd Mahmūd رحمہ اللہ studied the book in-depth; he made corrections and added valuable notes. He also gave me beneficial counsel and then wrote a detailed foreword,

adding to the brilliance of the book.

Similarly, Maulānā Mushtāq Ahmad took special care in copying down the references from my notes and finally Malik Tāriq Jawed, a student in the specialization class, who took on the responsibility of composing and proofreading. Maulānā Muhammad Ilyās did the final proofreading and then Maulānā Thanā-ullāh took on the task of publishing the work. May Allāh ﷻ accept all their work and bless them with the best of rewards.

May Allāh ﷻ accept our work, make it a means of steadfastness for the Muslims, a means of guidance for the Qādiyānīs and a means of our salvation and intercession of Sayyidunā Muhammad Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn ﷺ.

وصلی اللہ تعالیٰ علی سیدنا محمد خاتم النبیین والمرسلین وعلی آلہ وأصحابہ أجمعین . آمین

Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī

FOREWORD: MUFTĪ SA'ĪD AHMAD
PĀLANPŪRĪ ﷺ

(Ustādh of Hadīth: Dār-ul-'Ulūm Deoband & Head
Administrator: Majlis Tahaffuz Khatm-e-Nubuwwat)

الحمد لله رب العالمين والصلاة والسلام على سيد المرسلين وخاتم النبيين وعلى
آله وصحبه أجمعين. أما بعد :

ISLĀM is an eternal reality. Falsehood has always been clashing with it. From time immemorial, the falsehood of other groups has been knocking and clashing with Islām. A study of history shows that the more complete and perfect a religion is, the more falsehood it will have to deal with. The final religion and way of life was brought by Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

According to the ways of old, Islām was tested with the challenges of falsehood and it always wiped out external and internal trials. Rasūlullāh ﷺ informed the *Ummah* that it will split into seventy-three (73) sects; he ﷺ also prophesized that there will be false claimants to *Nubuwwat*. These are the internal trials that the *Ummah* have been made aware of. Sayyidunā Thaubān رضي الله عنه narrates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “There will be thirty (30) liars in my *Ummah*, each of them will claim to be a Nabī, whereas I complete the chain of

Nubuwwat, there is no Nabī after me.”ⁱ

Hāfiz Ibn Hajar رحمہ اللہ in *Fath-ul-Bārī* (vol.13 p.343) and ‘Allāmah Badr-ud-Dīn ‘Aynī رحمہ اللہ in *‘Umdat-ul-Qārī* (vol.7 p.555) have explained that the number thirty (30) in the Hadīth refers to those who will have followers; they will have a group and party under them, otherwise it is very difficult to count the number of false claimants of *Nubuwwat*.

Subsequently, over the fourteen centuries of Islām’s history, there were countless people who made such claims. After some time, they fell into oblivion. However, there were some of them whose deceit took on a very dangerous form. The first one was Musaylamah Kadh-dhāb from Yamāmah. He had a group of forty thousand (40 000) under him. The Sahābah رضی اللہ عنہم dealt with this *fitnah* during the time of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضی اللہ عنہ by an army that was sent under the leadership of Sayyidunā Khālīd Ibn Walīd رضی اللہ عنہ.

After this, this very same *fitnah* came up time and again. An example of this is the *Bābiyyah fitnah*. The founder of this sect was ‘Alī Muhammad Bāb. He made claims of *Nubuwwat* and in fact, he later claimed divinity. The effects of this are felt to this day.

Similarly, approximately a century ago, a person by the

ⁱ Sunan Abū Dāwūd vol.2 p.224

name of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad from Qādiyān, Punjab, made the false claims of *Mahdawiyyat*, *Masīhiyyat* and *Nubuwwat*. His work and movement flourished under the shadow of the government of the time. The ‘*Ulamā*’ of Islām practised upon the ways of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ؓ and started working to tackle this *fitnah*. Without differentiating between backgrounds and personalities, they worked hard with fervour and enthusiasm. The ‘*Ulamā*’ of Deoband played a leading role in this entire struggle. Sayyid-ut-Tā’ifah Hadrat Hājī Imdād-ullāh Muhājir Makkī ؒ was apprehensive before this *fitnah* arose. He felt that a new *fitnah* was going to break out in Hindustan.

When the *fitnah* arose, Hadrat Gangohī ؒ, Hadrat Shaykh-ul-Hind ؒ and other great ‘*Ulamā*’ took notice of it and in 1331 A.H, they issued the following *fatwā*, ‘Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad and his followers will slowly enter the ranks of the renegades, *zindīqs*, *mulhids*, disbelievers and deviated sects.’

Hadrat Shaykh-ul-Hind ؒ signed this *fatwā* and wrote the following words, ‘the beliefs and statements of Mirzā (upon him be whatever he deserves) being of a blasphemous nature is such a clear subject that no just and understanding person will deny. The detail is mentioned in the answer.’

Then, the student of Hadrat Shaykh-ul-Hind ؒ,

Hadrat Maulānā Muhammad Anwar Shah Kashmīrī ؒ - Shaykh-ul-Hadīth of Dār-ul-‘Ulūm Deoband – turned this issue into his permanent concern. He turned the focus of his students in this direction and they did great work against Qādiyānism.

Besides Hadrat Maulānā Muhammad Anwar Shah Kashmīrī ؒ, the other great elders of Deoband like Maulānā Ashraf ‘Alī Thānwī ؒ, Muftī A’dham Maulānā Kifāyat-ullāh Dehlawī ؒ, Shaykh-ul-Islām Maulānā Husayn Ahmad Madanī ؒ, ‘Allāmah Shabbīr Ahmad ‘Uthmānī ؒ, Maulānā Sayyed Murtada Hasan Chāndpūrī ؒ, Maulānā Thanā-ullāh Amritsarī ؒ, and Maulānā Ahmad ‘Alī Lāhorī ؒ did great work by lecturing and writing and protected the belief of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*.

In addition, Hadrat Maulānā Muhammad Anwar Shah Kashmīrī ؒ prepared a valuable treasure of work, covering the principles of *Dīn* and the principles of *Takfīr*, through the programmes held in refutation of Qādiyānism that will be of use until the world remains in existence. Through this work, the *Ummah* will acquire light in order to deal with every *fitnah*.

The following students of Hadrat Maulānā Muhammad Anwar Shah Kashmīrī ؒ did great work in order to deal with this *fitnah* and prepared an entire library in refutation of Qādiyānism. These great scholars went to

every town and city of Hindustan and clarified the truth. May Allāh ﷻ reward them on behalf of the Muslims, Āmīn.

1. Muftī Muhammad Shafi' ﷺ
2. Maulānā Muhammad Yūsuf Binnorī ﷺ
3. Maulānā Muhammad Idrīs Kāndehlawī ﷺ
4. Maulānā Badr-e-'Alam Mīrthī ﷺ
5. Maulānā Hifz-ur-Rahmān Sewhārwi ﷺ
6. Maulānā 'Abdul Qādir Raipūrī ﷺ
7. Maulānā Sayyed 'Atā-ullāh Shah Bukhārī ﷺ
8. Maulānā Muhammad Manzūr Nu'mānī ﷺ
9. Maulānā Ahmad 'Alī Lahorī ﷺ
10. Maulānā Muhammad 'Alī Jālandharī ﷺ
11. Maulānā Muhammad Chirāgh, Gujranwala ﷺ
12. Maulānā Ghulām-ullāh Khan ﷺ

After the countries were partitioned, this *fitnah* was concentrated in Pakistan and the Qādiyānīs took Rabwah as their headquarters. It was from here that this particular *fitnah* started boiling over and spreading. However, look at the planning of Allāh ﷻ, just as Hadrat Hājī Imdād-ullāh Makkī ﷺ was apprehensive before the *fitnah* broke out and he called one of his

Khulafā' back to Hindustan, and informed him that a *fitnah* will break out there, in exactly the same way, Hadrat Maulānā Muhammad Anwar Shah Kashmīrī رحمہ اللہ made Maulānā Sayyed 'Atā-ullāh Shah Bukhārī رحمہ اللہ the Amīr-e-Sharī'at and pledged allegiance at his hands. This was done at a huge gathering in 1930, in order to deal with the *fitnah* of Qādiyānism.

Five hundred (500) other '*Ulamā*' also pledged allegiance in a gathering held for this work. Subsequently, after the partition, Maulānā 'Atā'-ullāh Shah Bukhārī رحمہ اللہ started to work against the *fitnah*. There is a long history of this particular struggle. Finally, in 1947, there was a powerful movement in which Maulānā Muhammad Yūsuf Binnorī رحمہ اللہ, Muftī Muhammad Shafī' رحمہ اللہ, Maulānā Muhammad Idrīs Kāndehlawī رحمہ اللہ and Maulānā Ihtishām-ul-Haq Thānwī رحمہ اللہ participated.

After thousands of Muslims were martyred, the government of Pakistan declared the Qādiyānīs as a non-Muslim minority on 7 September 1974. An ordinance was passed on 26 April 1984 that stated that Qādiyānism is a plot against Islām, Qādiyānīs were forbidden from using the word Islām for themselves and they were prohibited from using Islāmic symbols and technical terms.

After this ordinance, the fourth representative of Mirzā

Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī – Mirzā Tāhir – left his headquarters in Rabwah, Pakistan and fled to London. He sought refuge under the shadow of their old benefactor and started propagating their deviation in Europe and Africa. Whilst there, they looked towards Hindustan once again and they fervently worked on their old headquarters, Qādiyān, a second time. They started hosting conferences and gatherings in different parts of the country.

The elders from Dār-ul-‘Ulūm Deoband felt it necessary to prepare the graduates of the Dār-ul-‘Ulūm once again to deal with this *fitnah*. Subsequently, on 29 to 31 October 1986, an international *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* conference was held in the area around Dār-ul-‘Ulūm Deoband. This created a sense of awareness amongst the ‘*Ulamā*’. In this conference, it was announced that an organization for the protection of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* will be set up.

Until now, this organization has published twenty-seven (27) pamphlets and booklets. These have been distributed in the thousands. In addition, training retreats and courses have been set up in a number of places in the country.

The graduates of Dār-ul-‘Ulūm Deoband have also held a number of training retreats and courses for the students of the Dār-ul-‘Ulūm. A retreat and course

was held in 1410 A.H for the second time on a national level. Hadrat Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī, a well-known scholar from Pakistan, was invited.

He was a resident of Chiniot, Jhang. Only the Chenub River separates Chiniot and Rabwah. He graduated from Jāmi'ah Islāmiyyah Tandwala Sindh. Great scholars like Hadrat Maulānā 'Abdur-Rahmān Kemilpūrī رحمہ اللہ, Hadrat Maulānā Muhammad Badr-e-'Alam Mīrthī رحمہ اللہ, Hadrat Maulānā Dost Muhammad رحمہ اللہ and Hadrat Maulānā Muhammad Yūsuf Binnorī رحمہ اللہ were amongst his teachers.

After he graduated, it was his special mission to deal with Qādiyānism. Subsequently, he has debated on the subject at least twenty-two (22) times in different areas against the Qādiyānīs and he defeated them. He toured many countries of the world for this cause. His lessons in refutation of Qādiyānism and training retreats have been widely accepted.

Upon the invitation of Dār-ul-'Ulūm Deoband, he came in 1410 A.H/1989 C.E as a lecturer. He delivered a number of lectures that were very interesting and kept the audience captivated. The students and graduates of Dār-ul-'Ulūm Deoband took great benefit from him and were very affected by his personality, his method of

explanation and vast knowledge.

During his presentation, Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad took help from his notes. These notes were copied and handed out to the students wherever the training courses were held. Maulānā would explain whilst keeping these notes in front of him. Subsequently, when preparations started to host the training course at Dār-ul-‘Ulūm Deoband, Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad sent the original copy of his notes. These covered just over a hundred foolscap pages.

The cost of copying these was quite expensive because of the quantity that was required. Therefore, it was prepared in book form and published very quickly.

This book was then distributed amongst the participants. The references in this copy were from the old Qādiyānī books. Because of this, Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad would note down the references from *Rūbānī Khazā’in*. In addition, he felt the need to arrange the notes anew. This work was given to a very able graduate of Dār-ul-‘Ulūm Deoband, Muftī Muhammad Salmān Mansūrpūrī.

Muftī Muhammad Salmān Mansūrpūrī currently serves as the deputy Muftī at Jāmi’a Qāsimiyyah Shāhī

Muradabad. He participates enthusiastically in the training courses held in other areas too.

Muftī Muhammad Salmān Mansūrpūrī arranged the notes anew with the help of the published book, his own notes that were taken during the course, the recordings of the programmes and the guidance of Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī. Maulānā Shāh ‘Ālam and Maulānā ‘Azīz-ul-Haq assisted with the referencing. The manuscript was then sent to Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī. He returned the copy after adding necessary information and gave further valuable advice. After this, the publication of the work began.

After the work was published, I read the entire book on a journey. *Māshā Allāh*, the work is brilliant and provides silencing responses. It is the crux of the lifetime effort made by Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī. I felt it necessary to edit a few places. I did this without his permission, relying upon his noble character to permit it.

I have given the Arabic name to the book, ‘*Husūl-ul-Amānī fī Ar-Radd ‘alā Talbīs Al-Qādiyānī*’ and the Urdu name, ‘*Radd-e-Qādiyāniyyat ke Zarri Usūl*’. Both names were printed on the cover.

The book is very simple and extremely interesting. It is a collection of the golden maxims in order to refute Qādiyānism. It will prove beneficial for the scholars, students and the masses. This is because the matter at hand is not only theory, but it is the basis of *īmān* and it is agreed upon. Every Muslim is aware of this. The only need is to understand the confusion being spread by the Qādiyānīs or Mirzā'īs and the method to refute them. This objective is acquired in the best way through this book. May Allāh ﷻ let all Muslims benefit from this book.

May Allāh ﷻ especially grant the divine ability to the 'Ulamā' and students to equip themselves fully with the material provided in this book so that they can engage fully in every place to deal with the *fitnah* of Qādiyānism.

May Allāh ﷻ accept the efforts of Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī in the protection of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* and may this work be a treasure for him in the hereafter. Āmīn

It will not be appropriate if I do not mention Qārī Muhammad 'Uthmān, Ustādh at Dār-ul-'Ulūm Deoband. His efforts at every stage of the publication of this book cannot be overlooked. If it were not for his

enthusiasm and interest in bringing this task to fruition, then probably the *Ummah* would not have been able to benefit from this book.

We cannot overlook the efforts of Maulānā Mu'izz-ud-Dīn Ahmad in editing and correcting the text. May Allāh ﷻ grant him the best of reward. Āmīn

وصلی اللہ تعالیٰ علی النبی الکریم وعلی آلہ وصحبہ أجمعین .

Sa'id Ahmad Pālanpūrī ﷻ

Dār-ul-'Ulūm Deoband

3 Jumād-al-Ūlā 1414



CHAPTER ONE

BIOGRAPHY OF MIRZĀ GHULĀM AHMAD QĀDIYĀNĪ

Before the study of Qādiyānism, it is necessary to learn of the life of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. This is so that the Qādiyānīs or Mirzā'īs – his followers – can gauge and understand that he is not even worthy of being classified as a noble human being, let alone make the grave error of thinking him to be a *Mahdī* or *Masīh* or Nabī or Rasūl. A brief biography of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī will be presented hereunder. The information is sourced from the books of the Qādiyānīs.

NAME & LINEAGE

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī introduces himself as follows, 'My name is Ghulām Ahmad, my father is Ghulām Murtadā and my grandfather's name is 'Atā Muhammad. My great-grandfather was Gul Muhammad. As I had explained, our nation is Moghul. From the preserved documents of my forbears, it is known that they had come to this country from

Samarqand.ⁱ

BIRTH

The hometown of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is Qādiyān, Godraspūr, Punjab. He writes about the date of his birth ‘I was born in 1839 C.E or 1840 C.E. during the last part of the Sikhs. In 1857 C.E. I was about sixteen (16) or seventeen (17) years old.’ⁱⁱ

PRIMARY EDUCATION

Whilst in Qādiyān, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad had learnt under a number of teachers. He describes this as follows, ‘During my childhood, a Persian teacher was employed for me as a servant.’ⁱⁱⁱ He taught the Qur’ān and a few Persian books to me. His name was Fadl Ilāhī. When I was about ten (10) years old, an Arabic teacher was appointed for my nurturing. His name was Fadl Ahmad. I feel that because my education was the initial benevolence of Allāh ﷻ, that is why the first names of these teachers were also ‘Fadl’. The Arabic teacher was a Maulānā and he was religious and pious. He used to teach with great effort and devotion. I learnt

ⁱ Kitāb Al-Bariyyah, footnote, p.134, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.13 p.162

ⁱⁱ Kitāb-ul-Bariyyah p.146, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.13 p.177

ⁱⁱⁱ Note the ‘respect’ and ‘honour’ for his teacher – Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī

a number of books in etymology and syntax from him. After the age of sixteen (16) or seventeen (17), I had the chance to study from another Maulānā for a few years. His name was Gul ‘Alī Shāh. My father had also employed him as a servant to teach in Qādiyān. I had studied syntax and logic from the last person I mentioned.

I studied the sciences to the level that Allāh ﷻ wanted. I had also acquired the knowledge of Tibb from my father. He was an experienced *Tabīb*. At that time, I paid so much of attention to studying books that it was as though I was not in this world.’ⁱ

YOUTH & EMPLOYMENT

After Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad acquired understanding and entered the youth stage of his life, he would wander and roam around because of his friends and company. We gauge this from the following incident. The son of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, Bashīr Ahmad, writes, ‘My mother explained to me that on one occasion during his youth, Hadrat Masīh Mau’ūd went to collect the pension of his father, and Mirzā Imām-ud-Dīn went behind. After he collected the pension, Mirzā Imām-ud-Dīn had duped and deceived him, and instead of

ⁱ Kitāb-ul-Bariyyah, footnote pp.148-150, Rūhānī Khazā’in, footnote, vol. 13 pp.179-18

going to Qādiyān, they went out somewhere else. They wandered and roamed different places. After they had spent all the money, his friend, Mirzā Imām-ud-Dīn left him. Hadrat Masīh Mau'ūd did not return out of shame. It was the desire of his grandfather that he gets a job, so he was employed in Siyalkot, in the office of the Deputy Commissioner for a paltry salary.ⁱ

FAVOURABLE VIEW OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT

During his employment in Siyalkot, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad mixed with the European missionaries and some English officers. He would have lengthy secret meetings with Christian priests under the pretext of religious discussion. They had promised and guaranteed their help and support to him. In *Sīrat Masīh Mau'ūd* p.15, there is mention of Reverend Butler, the head of British Intelligence; Siyalkot mission, meeting with Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. This took place in 1868 C.E. A few days later, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī left the job at the Deputy Commissioner's officeⁱⁱ and took up residence at Qādiyān. He started writing and authoring.

ⁱ *Sīrat Al-Mahdī* vol. 1 p.43

ⁱⁱ Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad had this job for four (4) years, from 1864 C.E. to 1868 C.E. (*Sīrat Al-Mahdī* vol.1 pp.154-158)

BEGINNING OF THE ATTACK ON ISLĀM THROUGH THE SLOGAN OF THE TRUTHFULNESS OF ISLĀM

After coming to Qādiyān, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad had a number of debates with the Christians, Hindus and Aryans so that he could draw the attention of the general Muslims to himself. After this, he started writing the book '*Barābhīn Ahmadiyyah*'. Most of the content of this particular work was in agreement with the beliefs of the general Muslims. However, together with this, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad added some of his 'inspirations'. The irony is that he wrote this book in order to show the truth of Islām, but he announced very fervently that people should display complete obedience to the English. In addition, he passionately proclaimed the prohibition of *Jihād*. From 1880 C.E. to 1884 C.E. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had completed four parts of *Barābhīn Ahmadiyyah*. The fifth part was published in 1905 C.E.

MELANCHOLIA/HYSTERIA

The moment the English had shown Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī the mirage of being the leader of the Muslims, he was affected by hysteria or melancholia. Let us study a definition and the signs of this illness before presenting proof of this illness affecting Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī so that one can easily

understand the subject matter that will follow after that.

1. Melancholia refers to a change in the thoughts of a person. A person becomes fearful and his nature is characterized by gloomy forebodings. In some cases, the patient affected reaches the point where he feels he knows of the unseen and can predict what will happen. The corruption of the mind in this condition of some patients takes them to the point where they feel themselves to be angels and sometimes things even greater, to the degree where they feel themselves to be a deity.ⁱ
2. Most of the delusion of the patient is related to those things that he was involved in whilst healthy. For example, if the patient is a person of knowledge, he will make claims of being a messenger, of doing miraculous things, speaking of divinity and conveying this to people.ⁱⁱ

If anyone wants to search for a person that fits this diagnosis perfectly, then he should study the life of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. The first bout of melancholia that came over Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was after the death of his son, Bashīr Ahmad

ⁱ Sharh Asbāb, Urdu, p.105

ⁱⁱ Iksīr A'dham vol.1 p.188

(1888 C.E.). *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī* states, ‘my mother explained to me that the first time that Hadrat Masīh Mau’ūd (i.e. my father) was affected by hysteria was a few days after the demise of Bashīr I. He came at night to wake up my mother, and thereafter his health became quite bad. This was a light bout of the illness. My mother says that after this he started getting affected by bouts of hysteria to a very severe degree. I asked, “What would happen during these bouts of hysteria?” She said, “His hands and feet would become cold and the muscles of his body would be pulled, especially the neck muscles.” He would experience dizziness and he could not control his body at that time. These bouts would be quite severe, but later on such severity did not remain. Some of these bouts became his nature and way.”ⁱ

CLAIMS OF MIRZĀ

Until 1880 C.E., Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī would claim that he is inspired from Allāh ﷻ. In 1882 C.E. he claimed to be a Mujaddid, in 1891 C.E. he made claims of being the Promised Messiah, in 1898 C.E. he claimed to be the *Mahdī*. Then in 1899 C.E. he claimed *Zillī Burūzī Nubuwwat* and in 1901 C.E. he made the claim of complete *Nubuwwat*.

ⁱ *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī* vol.1 p.13

All the claims were made after he was affected by melancholia and hysteria. Hence, all of these will be understood as effects of this illness. We will mention hereunder a few of the critical claims he made, with the references.

CLAIM OF BEING THE BAYT-ULLĀH

‘Part of the divine inspiration is that Allāh has named me *Bayt-ullāh* also.’ⁱ

CLAIM OF BEING THE MUJADDID (1882 C.E)

‘At the end of the thirteenth century and upon the dawn of the fourteenth century, Allāh informed me by means of inspiration, ‘You are the Mujaddid of this century’.’ⁱⁱ

CLAIM OF BEING MA’MŪR (1882 C.E)

‘I have come as *Ma’mūr* (i.e. commanded) from Allāh.’ⁱⁱⁱ

ⁱ Arba’īn p.4, Rūhānī Khazā’īn vol.17 p.445

ⁱⁱ Kitāb-ul-Bariyyah p.168 (footnote), Rūhānī Khazā’īn vol.13 p.201

ⁱⁱⁱ Nusrat-ul-Haq dar Rūhānī Khazā’īn vol.21 p.66, Kitāb-ul-Bariyyah dar Rūhānī Khazā’īn vol.13 p.203

CLAIM OF BEING NADHĪR (1882 C.E)

الرحمن علم القرآن لتنذر قوما ما أنذر آبائهم

Allāh has taught you the Qur'ān so that you can warn those whose forefathers were not warned.ⁱ

CLAIM OF BEING ĀDAM, MARYAM & AHMAD (1883 C.E)

يا آدم اسكن أنت وزوجك الجنة يا مريم اسكن أنت وزوجك الجنة يا أحمد
اسكن أنت وزوجك الجنة نفخت فيك من لدني روح الصدق

O Ādam, O Maryam, O Ahmad, you and whoever is your follower and friend, enter Jannah, i.e. the means of real salvation. I have blown the soul of truthfulness into you from My side.ⁱⁱ

Commentary:

Maryam does not refer to Maryam, the mother of 'Īsā, Ādam does not refer to the father of humanity, nor does Ahmad here refer to the final Nabī ﷺ. Similarly, in all the 'inspirations', wherever the names of Mūsā, 'Īsā, Dāwūd and others come, these names do not refer

ⁱ Tadhkirah p.44, Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah dar Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.1 p.69, Darūrat-ul-Imām dar Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.13 p.502

ⁱⁱ Tadhkirah p.70, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.1 p.590 (footnote)

to the *Ambiyā'*, but in every place, it refers to this one, i.e. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad.ⁱ

CLAIM OF RISĀLAT (1884 C.E)

إلهام : إني فضلتك على العالمين قل أرسلت إليكم جميعا

Inspiration: I have given you virtue over the worlds, say, 'I have been sent to all of you.'ⁱⁱ

CLAIM OF TAUHĪD & TAFRĪD (1886 C.E)

Inspiration: You are to me like my *Taubīd* and *Tafrīd*. You are from me and I am from you.ⁱⁱⁱ

CLAIM OF MATHĪL MASĪH (1891 C.E)

Through divine revelation and inspiration, I have made the claim of being *Mathīl Masīh*. It has also been made apparent to me that information about me has been given in the Noble Qur'ān and Ahādīth from before. I have been promised.^{iv}

ⁱ Maktūbāt Ahmadiyyah vol.1 p.82 from Tadhkirah p.70

ⁱⁱ Tadhkirah p.129, Maktūb Hadrat Masīh Mau'ūd (30 December 1884), Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.17 p.353

ⁱⁱⁱ Tadhkirah p.141 & 384, Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah dar Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.1 p.581

^{iv} Tadhkirah p.172, Tablīgh-e-Risālat vol.1 p.159

CLAIM OF BEING MASĪH IBN MARYAM (1891 C.E)

إلهام : جعلناك المسيح ابن مريم

Inspiration: ‘We have made you Masīh Ibn Maryam’, tell them that I have come in the footsteps of ‘Īsā.ⁱ

Abandon speaking about Ibn Maryam

Better than him is Ghulām Ahmadⁱⁱ

CLAIM OF BEING ‘THE BEING OF KUN FA YAKŪN’ (1892 C.E)

إلهام : إنما أمرك إذا شيئا أن تقول له كن فيكون

Inspiration: Your matter is that whenever you intend anything, you say, ‘be’ and it becomes.ⁱⁱⁱ

CLAIM OF BEING MASĪH & MAHDĪ (1894 C.E)

بشرني وقال إن المسيح الموعود الذي يرقبونه والمهدي المسعود الذي ينتظرونه هو أنت

Allāh has given me glad tidings and said, “The

ⁱ Tadhkirah p.185, Izālah Auhām dar Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.442

ⁱⁱ Dāfī’-ul-Balā’ dar Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.18 p.240

ⁱⁱⁱ Tadhkirah p.203, Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah part 5 dar Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.21 p.124

Promised Messiah and Fortunate *Mahdī* that they are waiting for is you.”ⁱ

CLAIM OF BEING IMĀM-E-ZAMĀN (1898 C.E)

I say without reservation that through the grace and benevolence of Allāh, I am the *Imām-e-Zamān*.ⁱⁱ

CLAIM OF BEING A ZILLĪ NABĪ (1900 C.E. TO 1908 C.E)

“When I am Rasūlullāh ﷺ as a *Burūzī Messenger* and all the perfections of Muhammad with *Nubuwwat* are reflected in my mirror. So which different human being is it that made a separate claim of *Nubuwwat*? ”ⁱⁱⁱ

CLAIM OF NUBUWWAT & RISĀLAT

1. We sent him close to Qādiyān^{iv}
2. The true deity is the one that sent me as his Rasūl in Qādiyān.^v
3. “I am a Rasūl and a Nabī, i.e. I have been sent

ⁱ Tadhkirah p.257, Itmām-ul-Hujjah dar Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.8 p.275

ⁱⁱ Darūrat-ul-Īmām dar Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.13 p.495

ⁱⁱⁱ Ek Ghaltī kā Izālah dar Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.18 p.212

^{iv} Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah footnote of Rāhānī Khazā’ in vol.1 p.593

^v Dāfī’-ul-Balā dar Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.18 p.231

and I am informed of the unseen.”ⁱ

4. The true deity is the one who sent his Rasūl, i.e. this weak one, with guidance and the true religion. He also sent him with reform of character.ⁱⁱ
5. The able deity will protect Qādiyān from the destruction of the plague so that you can understand that Qādiyān has been protected because the messenger of Allāh and his messenger was in Qādiyān.ⁱⁱⁱ

CLAIM OF BEING A NABĪ & RASŪL WITH AN INDEPENDENT SHARĪ’AH

1. And say, ‘O people, I have come to you all as the Rasūl of Allāh.’^{iv}
2. ‘We have sent a Rasūl to you just as we sent a Rasūl to Fir’aun.’^v
3. And say that a *Sāhib-ush-Sharī’ah* falsifies and is destroyed, not every liar. Firstly, this claim has no

ⁱ Ek Ghaltī kā Izālāh dar Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.18 p.211

ⁱⁱ Tadhkirah p.492, Arba’in no.3 dar Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.17 p.426

ⁱⁱⁱ Dāfī’-ul-Balā dar Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.18 pp.225, 226

^{iv} Tadhkirah p.352, Rabwah

^v Haqīqat-ul-Wahī dar Rūhānī Khazā’in vo.22 p.105

proof. Allāh ﷻ has not made any condition of making up or fabricating the *sharī'ah*. Besides this, understand what a *sharī'ah* is. He who explains a few commands and prohibitions through revelation that comes to him and stipulates a law for his nation, he becomes a *Sāhib-ush-Sharī'ah*. In the light of this definition, our opposition are also bound because there are commands and prohibitions in the revelation. For example, this inspiration, 'tell the believers to lower their gaze and protect their private parts, that is purer for them', this is part of *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah*.ⁱ It has a command and a prohibition.ⁱ Twenty-three (23) years have passed and until now there are commands and prohibitions in the revelation that comes to me. If you say that *sharī'ah* refers to that particular *sharī'ah* that has new laws, then this is baseless and unfounded. Allāh ﷻ says, 'Indeed this is written in the previous scriptures. The scriptures of Ibrāhīm and Mūsā', i.e. the teachings of the Qur'ān are in the Taurāt. If you say that *sharī'ah* is that which mentions commands and prohibitions anew, then this is also baseless because if the Taurāt or

ⁱ This verse has a word showing command. However, where is the prohibition? The Qādiyānīs should search for it and point it out.

Qur'ān mentions law anew, then there would be no scope for *Ijtihād*.ⁱ

4. Indeed you are from the Messengers, upon the straight path.ⁱⁱ
5. He spoke to me and called unto me and said, "Indeed I am deputing you to a corrupt nation and I am making you a leader for people and I am appointing you as a vicegerent just as my way was from before."ⁱⁱⁱ 'He is the one who sent his messenger with guidance and the true religion so that it can overpower every other religion.'^{iv} 'Now it is clear that these inspirations have been mentioned regarding me repeatedly, that I am the messenger of Allāh, I am commanded by him, and I have come as a trustworthy one from Allāh. Believe in whatever I say and whoever is an enemy of it will be a dweller of hell.'^v

These are some of the claims of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. As we have mentioned before, only two things prompted these claims.

ⁱ Arba'īn No.4 dar Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.17 pp.435, 436

ⁱⁱ Haqīqat-ul-Wahī dar Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.22 p.110

ⁱⁱⁱ Anjām Ātham dar Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.11 p.79

^{iv} I'jāz Ahmadī p.7, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.19 p.113

^v Anjām Ātham dar Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.11 p.62

1. Creation of division amongst the Muslims and support for the British government
2. The effects of melancholia and hysteria

One should explain these two reasons and causes to the people and present the claims of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī so that their minds will easily be able to grasp and accept that the basis of these claims is not spirituality or intelligence, but it is only materialism, foolishness and falsehood.

MARRIAGES OF MIRZĀ

1. The first wife of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was Hurmat Bībī. She is famously known as Pajhedi Ma. From the beginning, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad had dislike for her. The reason for this was that this wife was affected by the opposition of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad, i.e. those who did not fall into his trap. Later on, after the case of Muhammadī Begum, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad divorced her.ⁱ
2. The second wife was Nusrat Jahan Begum. The Mirzā's refer to her as *Umm-ul-Mu'minīn*. There are many narrations in *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī* about Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad narrated from her.

ⁱ Summarized from *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī* Part 1 pp.26-27

3. The third wife was Muhammadi Begum. This wife was supposedly married to him in heaven. The summary of this issue is that the father of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad did not accept that this marriage take place so Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made up an inspiration that was supposedly from the divine, 'we wed her to you'. Even after this, Muhammadi Begum did not come to him and this woman lived her entire life with another person by the name of Sultan Muhammad. She had five (5) sons and two (2) daughters from him. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī left the world with the regret in his heart that she did not come to him. The detail of this will be mentioned ahead Inshā Allāh.

CHILDREN

From the first wife, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had two (2) sons:

1. Mirza Sultan Ahmad
2. Mirza Fadl Ahmad

These two (2) sons were totally indifferent to the preposterous claims of their father.ⁱ

ⁱ At this point, bear in mind that in *Ā'ina Kamālāt* p.548, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī wrote that whoever does not believe in him

From the second wife, Nusrat Jahan Begum, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad had ten (10) children. From these, Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd Ahmad (Second Representative), Mirzā Bashīr Ahmad (author of *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī*), Mirzā Sharīf Ahmad, Mubārakah Begum and Amat-ul-Hafīz lived on after the death of their father. ‘Ismat Begum, Bashīr Ahmad I, Shaukat Begum, Mubārak Ahmad and Amat-un-Nasīr had passed away during his lifetime.ⁱ

DEATH

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī died on a Tuesday, 26 May 1908 from Cholera. Mīr Nāsir Nawāb Sāhib (father-in-law of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad) writes, ‘I had gone to my house and was already asleep on the night that Mirzā fell ill. When he experienced great difficulty, he woke me up. When I came to him and saw his condition, he said to me, “Mīr Sāhib, I have been afflicted with cholera. After this, he did not say anything clear according to my recollection until he

and verify his claims is the child of a whore. Now, his children from this wife did not believe and verify his claims, so this means that according to the writing of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, his sons are from a whore. – Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad

ⁱ *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī* vol.1 p.53

passed away the next day at ten o' clock.ⁱ

FIRST REPRESENTATIVE

After Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, the Qādiyānī Movement was handled by his most trusted companion, Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn. This person was a high ranking scholar and skilled doctor. In fact, it was said that the intricate aspects of knowledge and wayward interpretations presented by Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī were in reality the produce of the wicked mind of Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn.

There is an interesting incident that occurred before the deviation of Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn. On one occasion, he came to Maulānā ‘Abdur-Rahīm Sahāranpūrī رحمہ اللہ. He رحمہ اللہ said to Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn, “A person will claim *Nubuwwat* in Qadiyan and your name has been recorded in the *Laub Al-Mahfūz* as his companion.”ⁱⁱ

This observation and statement of Maulānā ‘Abdur-Rahīm Sahāranpūrī رحمہ اللہ was proven correct; word for word. Not only did Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn become the companion of the false claimant of *Nubuwwat*, he also became his first representative. Before coming to Qadiyan, Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn was amongst the

ⁱ Hayāt Nāsir p.14

ⁱⁱ Āp Bītī vol.6

government doctors under the Maharajah of Kashmir, Ranbir Singh. He was appointed by the English to spy and work against the Maharajah. After Ranbir Singh died in 1885 C.E, his son – Partab Singh – was appointed as the Rajah of Kashmir. Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn plotted against him and got Kashmir included under the English Council. The authority of the Maharajah was taken away and after Partab Singh came into a position of influence, he deported Nūr-ud-Dīn to Kashmir due to his disloyalty.ⁱ

Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn was an atheistic person in the beginning. His nature was inclined towards Naturalism. He took much effect from the books of Sir Sayyed Ahmad Khan.ⁱⁱ

Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn led the Qādiyānī Nation from 1908 C.E. to 1914 C.E. During his tenure of *Khilāfat*, i.e. being the representative, the most important work that the group did was to sabotage the *Khilāfat* Movement. He had a policy of supporting the general Muslims under the Farangī Government in opposition to the *Khilāfat* Movement. This caused this particular group (its followers and leaders) to break away from Islām

ⁱ Summarized from Qadiyan se Isrā'il Tak p.66

ⁱⁱ Sīrat-ul-Mahdī vol.2 p.57

completely. This made the name of this group reflect fully that it was a plant grown by the English.

SECOND REPRESENTATIVE

After the demise of Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn, there was a difference of opinion that arose regarding the *Khilāfat* of the Qādiyānī Group. Some people wanted to appoint the close disciple of Mirza Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, Molvi Muhammad ‘Alī as the *Khalīfah*, whereas the eldest son of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd had great hopes of the *Khilāfat*. After great effort from the wife of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī (Nusrat Jahan), along with the hard work of other disciples, Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd was appointed as the second *Khalīfah*. He was twenty-four (24) years old at the time. He was living the life of a prince. He was enjoying himself, engaging in adultery and other evils. The Qādiyānīs had torn the veil that covered his crimes and had written books and journals on this particular topic.ⁱ

Mirza Mahmūd wrote a *Tafsīr* of the Noble Qur’ān in ten volumes. This work contained nothing but nonsense and far-fetched interpretations. In addition, he wrote ‘*Sīrat Masīh Mau’ūd*’, a biography of his

ⁱ Tārīkh Mahmūdiyyat, Rabwah ka Madh-habī Āmir, Sheher Saddūm and others

father. During his time, there were a significant number of Qādiyānī preachers that had spread out under the supervision of the English. The seeds of Qādiyānism had been planted in London and other places.

Mirza Mahmūd remained the *Khalīfah* until 1965 C.E, the year of his demise.

THIRD REPRESENTATIVE

After Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd died, his eldest son, Nāsir Ahmad Qādiyānī, was chosen as the third representative. He made a significant amount of effort to spread the Qādiyānī religion in the world. He travelled to various parts of the world and set up headquarters in a number of places. He died in 1982 C.E. from a sudden heart attack.

FOURTH REPRESENTATIVE

After Mirzā Nāsir Ahmad, Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad became the fourth *Khalīfah* or representative. It was possible for him to acquire this position by kidnapping another hopeful of the *Khilāfat*, i.e. Mirzā Rafī' Ahmad. When his opposition was dealt with, he was accepted as the *Khalīfah*. On 27 April 1984, General Diyā'-ul-Haq, former Prime Minister of Pakistan had passed an ordinance banning the *Adhān* and other outstanding features of the Qādiyānīs, Mirzā Tāhir felt it safe to seek protection in the land of his supervisors, and he

migrated from Pakistan to London. In 1988 C.E he made a huge noise about *Mubāhala*, but by the grace of Allāh ﷻ, the true ‘*Ulamā*’ had furnished him with a solid response and refutation. The Qādiyānīs were defeated without any *Mubāhala*.

THE LAHORI SECT OF QĀDIYĀNĪS

Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd, the second *Khalīfah*, had lost the *Khilāfat* election and Molvi Muhammad ‘Alī Lahorī and his followers then separated from the main Qādiyānī Group. From 1914 C.E to 1920 C.E, these people remained in Qādiyān and kept their title of ‘*Ghayr Mubā’yi’in*’, i.e. those who do not pledge allegiance. They were identified by this title. In 1920 C.E, Molvi Muhammad ‘Alī came to Lahore and formed a new group called ‘*Anjuman Ishā’at-e-Islām Ahmadiyyah*’. He was chosen as the first leader of this group. After he died, Sadr-ud-Dīn was chosen as the next leader. Today the group is led by Dr Nasīr Ahmad.

The differences between the beliefs of the Qādiyānīs and the Ahmadīs can be studied from the words of Molvi Muhammad ‘Alī, he writes in ‘*Masīh Mau’ūd aur Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*’,

‘There are two groups of the Sect of Hadrat Masīh Mau’ūd; one is the Ahmadī. Their headquarters are in Lahore. The other is the Qādiyānī. Their headquarters

are in Qādiyān. The basic point of difference between the Qādiyānī and the Ahmadi comes down to two points. Firstly, was Hadrat Masīh Mau'ūd a Mujaddid or a Nabī? The representative of the Qādiyānī group says that he was a Nabī. The group from Lahore believes him to be a Mujaddid. Secondly, whichever Muslim does not pledge allegiance to him, is he within the fold of Islām or not? The Qādiyānī representative feels that whichever Muslim there is in the world and he or she does not pledge allegiance to Hadrat Masīh Mau'ūd, he is disbeliever (*kāfir*) and out of the fold of Islām. The group from Lahore believes that every person who recites the *Kalimah* is a Muslim. However, refuting the Mujaddid and the Masīh of the *Ummah* or opposing him is definitely an action that is worthy of reproach.ⁱ

In reality, there is no difference between these two groups of the Qādiyānīs. In fact, this difference of opinion and argument is only one of leadership and authority. If Molvi Muhammad 'Alī got the *Khilāfat* in place of Mirzā Mahmūd, he would have said the same thing as the common Qādiyānī.

Professor Ilyās Barnī has written that the difference between these two groups is only that the colour of one is deep red whilst the colour of the other is light red.

ⁱ Risālah Masīh Mau'ūd aur Khatm-e-Nubuwwat from Qādiyānī Madh-hab kā 'Ilmī Muhāsabah p.940

Then, our question is that if the difference between them is real and fundamental, then the Lahori group will be bound to say that the Qādiyānī group are disbelievers, because they believe a non-Nabī to be a Nabī. Similarly, it will be binding on the Qādiyānīs to say that the Lahoris are disbelievers because they deny the *Nubuwwat* of a ‘Nabī that is upon the truth’. However, none of the groups declare each other as disbelievers. We learn from this point that the difference between them is not real or fundamental, but it is cooked up.ⁱ

THE INTERESTING REALITY

At this point, one should bear an interesting reality in mind. During the lifetime of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, one of his disciples by the name of Chirāgh-ud-Dīn, claimed *Nubuwwat*. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī expelled him from his group because of this. After Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī died, there were many other Mirzās that claimed *Nubuwwat*, *Ilhām* and *Tajdīd*. Amongst those who made these claims were; Munshī Zahīr-ud-Dīn Arūpī, Khudā Bakh-sh Qādiyānī, ‘Abdullāh Tīmarpūrī, Sayyed ‘Ābid ‘Alī, Muhammad

ⁱ Study ‘*Rawidad Mubāhatha Rawalpindi*’ for the beliefs and proofs of each of the two groups. This work is very important. The proofs of each group are listed from the writings of Mirzā.

Siddīq Bihārī, Ahmad Nūr Kabulī and Nabī Bakh-sh Mirzā'ī. Some of them formed their own groups but these did not gain any momentum. For the details of these groups, study the work '*A'immah Talbīs*' of Maulānā Abul-Qāsim Rafīq Dilāwarī, Chapter 71 p.512 to p.517. For a detailed biography of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, one should study '*Ra'īs Qādiyān*' of Maulānā Abul-Qāsim Rafīq Dilāwarī.

CHAPTER TWO

SPECIFYING THE SUBJECT MATTER

The discussion and debates between the Muslims and the Mirza'is will generally cover the following three topics:

1. *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*: This refers to *Nubuwwat*, whether it continued after Rasūlullāh ﷺ or whether it came to an end with the coming of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.
2. The Demise of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ: This refers to the discussion that states that Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ had passed away and his grave is in Kashmir, or, he is alive and was lifted to the heavens and he will return.
3. The works of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī: This refers to his life and biography. Was his life of such a level where he could be accepted as a chosen messenger of Allāh ﷻ and can his life serve as a beacon of guidance for others? What was his character like?ⁱ

ⁱ Under this topic, there is a discussion regarding whether Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was a human being or not? He said about himself, 'I am not a worm, nor am I a human, I am a man's place of

SCHEME OF THE QĀDIYĀNĪS

The Mirzā'īs (Qādiyānīs) will first try to discuss two topics; *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* and *Wafāt-e-Īsā*. They will always avoid the topic of the character of Mirza Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. The reason for this is that *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* and *Hayāt-e-Īsā* are such topics in which they will utilise incorrect conclusions and drag the discussion on for quite a while. This will cause doubts to arise in the minds and hearts of the listeners. However, the third topic is such that it can be easily understood, differing interpretations cannot be made for it, nor can the discussion be made into a long one. Therefore, when discussing this subject matter, the Mirzā'īs (Qādiyānīs) see their death. This topic is their greatest weakness. They will never be prepared to discuss this topic.

disgust and a shame to humanity' (Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah from Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.21 p.127)

The question now arises, if he is not a human, how can he be deputed as a messenger to human beings? Therefore, there are two possibilities; either Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is truthful in this poem, or he is lying. It is quite clear that a liar cannot be a Nabī. If he is truthful in this poem, then too, he cannot be a Nabī for humanity; he can be a Nabī for non-human beings, like for the donkeys and animals.

DUTY OF THE MUSLIM DEBATER

Selecting the correct topic is the life of the debate. The person who selects the topic of his liking will be able to carry on speaking and debating on it. Therefore, the debater must remain ready on it and he should take that particular topic which indicates the weakness of the opposition. He must choose the topic that cannot be lengthened without benefit. This is the greatest success of the debater.

Whilst debating with the Mirzā'ī (Qādiyānī), one should keep the character of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī in the background. Wherever the topic might begin, bring it onto the life and biography of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. In addition, do not allow the Qādiyānī debater to go into any other topic or discussion. Remain firm upon this.

This instruction does not mean that we have a shortage of proofs regarding *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* or *Hayāt-e-Īsā* ﷺ, but the objective is to prevent a wastage of time and falling into long drawn out discussions that will create doubts in the minds of the masses. For example, the Mirzā'ī (Qādiyānī) debater will present the verses (إني (بل رفعه الله إليه) and (متوفيك) and he will say that *Khātām* refers to a ring etc. You will respond by saying that this is wrong and the correct purport is such and such. The pronoun refers to such and such. The meaning of

Khātām is not that which you have explained.

All these answers are technical and the masses cannot understand them well. Therefore, do not make the mistake of sufficing on academic topics with the Mirzā'īs (Qādiyānīs) or discussing the topics of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* and *Wafāt-e-Īsā* ﷺ only. Every scholar must bear this in mind and practice accordingly.

LEVELS OF SPECIFYING THE SUBJECT MATTER

When specifying the subject matter and topic of the debate, then bear in mind the following four levels:

First Level: Get the opposition to accept your topic and do not accept any topic from the Mirzā'ī (Qādiyānī).

Second Level: If you cannot get him to accept your topic, then do not accept the topic of the opposition.

Third Level: If you are forced to accept a topic from the opposition, then do so on condition that one topic of your own choice must be stipulated too. That topic should be the deeds and character of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

Fourth level: If the Qādiyānī forces his two topics onto you, then you should force your two topics onto him, i.e. the biography of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and the biography of his first representative, Mirzā

Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd. Until the topic is not decided, do not ever respond to anything. The method adopted by the Mirzā'ī debater is that in the beginning, he will present proofs of the continuity of *Nubuwwat* and the demise of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ. The Muslim debater will not want to hold back and will start responding. In this way, the direction of the discussion and the topic is automatically changed. The desire of the Mirzā'ī is hence achieved. At this point in time, one should adopt full understanding and remain firm on one's stance.

SOME TRIED & TESTED WAYS OF SPECIFYING THE SUBJECT MATTER

If the debater is clever and quick witted, he will select such ways that will force the opposition to accept the topic of discussion. However, for the sake of guiding the debater, a few aspects will be mentioned hereunder. If these are practised upon, it will become very easy to stipulate the subject matter. I have tried and experienced this many times.

START OF THE DISCUSSION

When speaking about specifying the topic, then start off from the point where you speak about the history of reformers and messengers. Throughout history, whenever a messenger or reformer came, he first showed his lofty character, pure life and towering

qualities. In this way, he fulfilled the duty of presenting his spiritual call in front of the people.ⁱ

When Rasūlullāh ﷺ climbed Mount Safa in order to proclaim the message of *Taubīd*, he first got his veracity confirmed. After everyone in a single voice said, “We have not experienced anything but the truth from you”ⁱⁱ He announced his Risālat and conveyed the message of *Taubīd*. Similarly, we shall not discuss the topic of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* until we do not find out whether he (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) is truthful or not. This is because if he is proven false in a single matter, then all his claims will be washed away and will be unreliable. We have not decided on this principle, but the Mirzā’i book, *Nusūs Qat’iyyah* points this out. Study a few references hereunder:

1. ‘It is clear that when a person is proven to have lied in one matter, then no reliance will be placed upon him in other matters.’ⁱⁱⁱ
2. The second Qādiyānī representative, Mirzā Bashīr-

ⁱ Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has written of the same in *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* vol.1 p.108, *Rūhānī Khazā’in* p.108. In addition, he wrote the following about himself, (لقد لبثت فيكم عمرا من قبله أفلا تعقلون), *Tadhkirah* p.281, *Rūhānī Khazā’in* p.108.

ⁱⁱ *Sahīh Al-Bukhārī* p.702

ⁱⁱⁱ *Chashma Ma’rifat* p.222; *Rūhānī Khazā’in* vol.23 p.231

ud-Dīn Mahmūd has written in ‘*Da’wat Al-Amīr*’, ‘When it has been proven that a person has been instructed by Allāh, then it will be compulsory to believe in all his claims. In brief, the main question is that, is the claimant of the person as being commanded or instructed true or not? If his truthfulness is proven, then the truth of all his claims will be automatically proven.’ⁱ

3. The son of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes in *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī*, ‘Bashīr Ahmad says that the first *Khalīfah*, i.e. Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn said, ‘A person came to me and said, “Maulānā, Can there be a Nabī after Muhammad ﷺ?” I replied in the negative. He said, “If someone claims *Nubuwwat*, then?” I said, “Then we shall see if he is truthful and on the straight path or not. If he is truthful, then, his word will be accepted in all cases.”’ⁱⁱ

It has been clarified that in order to accept the claims of a person, it is necessary to know about his life and biography. This is supported by clear texts of the Mirzā’ī religion. Now there are two options for the Mirzā’īs; they should practice upon the clear guidelines of their religious leaders and be prepared to discuss the life of

ⁱ *Da’wat Al-Amīr* pp.49, 50

ⁱⁱ *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī* vol.1 p.98, Narration 109

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and his truthfulness or falsity, or they should declare the above guidelines of the Qādiyānī as wrong and false. If the Mirzā'ī is prepared to debate after hearing this, then the objective is acquired. If he says that the principle described is wrong, then we shall say that a religion that gives unacceptable and false guidance is totally wrong, false and is nothing but deception. In short, when considering both angles, the result will be in favour of the Muslim debater.

SECOND STAGE

During the initial part of the discussion, if you cannot silence the Mirzā'ī debater, then try as best as possible to force the person to accept your topic of discussion. Wherever you give narrated and logical proof, you should also continue using the words that describe Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, like *La'īn*, *Kadh-dhāb*, *Dajjāl* and so on. This will tear the veil that is covering the Mirzā'ī debater and he will try to defend his 'master'. In this way, the topic that you like to discuss will start.ⁱ

ⁱ We learnt this trick from a Mirzā'ī. Their way is that in the start, they will speak about the life and 'demise' of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ. If the Muslim debater is inexperienced, he will start to give responses. However, as we explained before, until the topic is not decided, do

Anyway, that was something by the way. The following discussions will prove beneficial in trying to stipulate the topic of the biography of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī;

In many books of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, he has written that the person who does not believe in him is a disbeliever, a dweller of hell, a hypocrite and someone without faith. In these declarations of blasphemy, there are no conditions stipulated, i.e. he issues a blanket statement of blasphemy (*kufṛ*). Study the following references;

1. ‘The one who does not follow you and does not pledge allegiance to you, and remains opposed to you, he is disobeying Allāh and His Rasūl and a dweller of hell (*jahannamī*).’ⁱ
2. ‘Allāh has made it clear to me that to whomever my call reaches and he does not accept me, he is not a

not make the mistake of replying to any proof they present. In short, this method of attack by us is very effective and has proven to be very successful. During the discussion, you must speak about the lowly and dirty life of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Most often, the Qādiyānī will try to respond and our objective will be fulfilled. We have used this attack with many debaters and came out successful – Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī

ⁱ Ishtihār Mi’yār Al-Akhyār vol.3 p.275, Tadhkirah p.343

Muslim.ⁱ


We learn from these references that according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, the basis of blasphemy (*kufr*) is denial of Mirzā, nothing else. Subsequently, the Bahā'ī and Parwezī sects deny the descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ and say that he ﷺ passed away. However, according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, such a person is a disbeliever too. This is because he does not verify and believe in Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Similarly, the Bahā'ī sect denies *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*, but they do not believe in Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, so according to the Mirzā'īs, they are out of the fold of their imaginary Islām. Hence, we learn that the basis is to verify or deny Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. When the entire discussion and matter is based on this, then the discussion should be on this point. Speaking about any other topic will not prove beneficial, but it will be a waste of time.


THIRD STAGE

In this stage, we shall present a few references that will force the Mirzā'ī debater to speak about the life of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and turn away from the discussion on Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ.

ⁱ Akhbār-ul-Fadl, 15 January 1935, Tadhkirah p.600

1. The belief of the descent of Masīh is not a belief that forms part of our fundamental beliefs. It is not a fundamental from the fundamentals of our religion. It is simply a prophecy from many hundreds of prophecies that have nothing to do with the reality of Islām. Until the time that this prophecy was not mentioned, Islām was not deficient. When it was discussed, then Islām was not perfected by it.ⁱ

2. ‘Before the appearance of the promised Masīh, if someone from the *Ummah* thought that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā  will come back to the world, then there will be no sin on him. It is only a slip in *ijtihād* which occurred from some of the *Ambiyā’* of the *Banū Isrā’īl* in understanding some of the prophecies.’ⁱⁱ

3. ‘Our objective has never been to go around arguing and debating about the life and demise of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā . This is a small matter.’ⁱⁱⁱ

4. ‘It is not correct to state that my coming to the world was only to remove the error regarding the life of Masīh. If this was the only error amongst the Muslims, there would have been no need to come just for this. This error has not only occurred today, I know that a

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Auhām p.140 from Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.171

ⁱⁱ Haqīqat-ul-Wahī from Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.22 footnote p.32

ⁱⁱⁱ Malfudhāt Ahmadiyyah vol.2 p.72

short while after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, this error spread. This was the thought of many pious people. If this was something important, then Allāh ﷻ would have removed it at that time.’ⁱ

SUMMARY

We conclude the following from the above references:

1. The belief of the descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is not a part of faith according to the Mirzā’is
2. This matter is not one of the fundamentals of their religion
3. This is a prophecy and has nothing to do with the reality of Islām
4. The belief of the life of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ spread during the *Khayr-ul-Qurūn*
5. A number of special pious servants of Allāh ﷻ remained upon this belief
6. This is not such an important matter that Allāh ﷻ felt necessary to remove
7. Having the belief of the descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is not a sin

ⁱ Ahmadi aur Ghayr Ahmadi me Faraq p.2

8. This was an error in *ijtihād*

9. This is a small matter and one should not argue or debate about it

After presenting the clear texts, the Mirzā'ī opposition should be told, “Since seeing that the demise and life of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is not a part of your faith, and the belief of *hayāt*, i.e. life, is an *ijtihādī* error at the very most, then this is not such a matter that you should debate and argue about. If there is no result from discussing this matter, then what is the benefit of debating and arguing over it? If you are a true follower of Mirzā, then practice upon his advice and stop debating an unimportant matter. Turn your attention in the direction of much more important issues, i.e. speak about the truthfulness and falsity of Mirzā, so that all the subsidiary subject matter will be automatically decided.”

A POSSIBLE OBJECTION & REPLY

It is possible that the Mirzā'ī will hear this discussion and raise the objection, ‘Well then, we shall not discuss the life and death, but we shall speak about the continuity of *Nubuwwat* and the end of *Nubuwwat*. This is because this subject is very important and we have not been prevented from speaking about it.’

The response to this objection can be given with

reference to a topic discussed above, i.e. beginning of the discussion. It is proven from an authentic narration of the Mirzā'ī religion that before we verify or attest to the claimant of the person as 'being commanded', we must do proper research with regards to whether he is worthy of being commanded by Allāh ﷻ or not. When this is a decided principle, then we shall work according to it and before we even think about the *Nubuwwat* claim of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, we have to do research and check if he is possibly a *Dajjāl* or liar. If he is, then there is no scope for discussion, nor is there any question of accepting him. In short, it will be binding on the Mirzā'īs to discuss the life of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and arrange for their disgrace, or classify the leaders of their religion as liars. We have full conviction that they will flee from this, as it is the easiest thing to do. We have experienced this many times already and history will repeat itself, *Inshā Allāh*.

AN IMPORTANT PRINCIPLE

Assuming that the Mirzā'ī debater does not budge and he remains adamant and you are forced to discuss *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* or the *Hayāt* and *Wafāt* of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ, or some expediency forces you to go into these topics, then you must decide the important principle that no group will give the meanings of the verses of the Noble Qur'ān from their own side, but

only the explanations and meanings given by the Mujaddidīn over the last thirteen (13) centuries will be accepted. This is because the basic difference between us and the Mirzā'īs is in the meanings of the verses; the words and verses are unanimously agreed upon. As for the interpolated meanings and explanations of the verses given by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, they are not acceptable to us at all. Therefore, the views of the Mujaddidīn will be taken as final. The Mujaddidīn we refer to are those who are accepted by the Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. These Mujaddidīn are listed in *'Asal Musaffā*, a work authored by Khudā Bakhsh, a disciple of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

It must remain clear to you that whilst *'Asal Musaffā* was being written, the completed portions would be read to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. If it was not read out to him, he would ask about it with great concern, 'Why was the book not read out today?' In short, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī would listen to the contents being read out and he would verify it. Therefore, the subject matter of this book has been accepted and approved by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

The author, Khudā Bakhsh, has stated the approval from Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī in the introduction to the book. Anyway, we quote from *'Asal Musaffā* hereunder regarding the Mujaddidīn, 'We have

shown above that it is necessary for a Mujaddid to come at the start of every century. This is because after every hundred (100) years, the conditions change and weakness comes about in the religion of Islām. Therefore, it is absolutely essential that someone with the special help of Allāh stands up to remove this weakness. He should try to remove whatever weakness has come about in the Muslims and show the religion in its original form; the form that was shown by Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Subsequently, in order to fulfil this objective, whichever personalities were accepted as Mujaddids over the last thirteen (13) centuries – whether they claimed to be so or others accepted them as such – are listed hereunder;


**THE FOLLOWING LUMINARIES WERE
ACCEPTED AS THE MUJADDID OF THE FIRST
CENTURY**

1. ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abdul ‘Azīz
2. Sālim
3. Qāsim
4. Makhūl

There were others besides the above luminaries that have been accepted as Mujaddidīn. The Mujaddid is the one that has a conglomeration of excellent traits and he

is the Mujaddid, whilst others fall under him. This can be understood in the light of the *Ambiyā'* of the *Banī Isrā'īl*, there would be a major Nabī and others would be secondary and do work under him. Subsequently, the Mujaddid of the first century that had all the excellent traits and good qualities was 'Umar Ibn 'Abdul 'Azīz.ⁱ

THE MUJADDIDĪN OF THE SECOND CENTURY

1. Imām Muhammad Ibn Idrīs Ash-Shāfi'ī
2. Imām Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Hanbal Shaybānī
3. Yahyā Ibn Ma'īn Ibn 'Aun 'Atfānī
4. Ash-hab Ibn 'Abdul 'Azīz Ibn Dawūd Qays
5. Abū 'Amr Mālīkī Misrī
6. Ma'mūn Ar-Rashīd
7. Qādhī Hasan Ibn Ziyād
8. Junayd Baghdādī
9. Sahl Ibn Abī Sahl Ash-Shāfi'ī
10. Hārith Ibn Asad Muhāsibī (according to Imām Sha'rānī )
11. Ahmad Ibn Khālīd Al-Khallāl Hanbalī (according to

ⁱ Najm-uth-Thāqib vol.2 p.9, Qurra Al-'Uyūn, Majālis Al-Abrār, Ta'rīf-ul-Ihyā' li Fadā'il Al-Ahyā' p.32

‘Allāmah ‘Aynī)

THE MUJADDDIDĪN OF THE THIRD CENTURY

1. Qādī Ahmad ibn Shurayh Baghdādī
2. Abul Hasan Ash’arī
3. Abū Ja’far Tahāwī
4. Ahmad Ibn Shu’ayb Nasā’ī
5. Khalīfah Al-Muqtadir Billāh
6. Shiblī
7. ‘Ubaydullāh Ibn Husayn
8. Abul Hasan Karkhī
9. Imām Baqī Ibn Makhlad Qurtubī

THE MUJADDIDĪN OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

1. Imām Abū Bakr Bāqillānī
2. Khalīfah Al-Qādir Billāh
3. Abū Hāmid Isfarā’inī
4. Hāfiz Abū Nu’aym
5. Abū Bakr Khwarizmī Hanafī
6. Hākīm Nayshapūrī (according to Shah Waliullāh)

7. Imām Bayhaqī
8. Abū Tālib, author of Qūt-ul-Qulūb
9. Hāfiz Ahmad Ibn ‘Alī Ibn Thābit Khatīb Baghdādī
10. Abū Ishāq Shirāzī
11. Ibrāhīm Ibn ‘Alī Ibn Yūsuf

THE MUJADDIDĪN OF THE FIFTH CENTURY

1. Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Abū Hāmid Al-Ghazālī
2. Rā’ūnī (according to ‘Aynī and Kirmānī)
3. Khalīfah Al-Mustazhir bid Dīn Al-Muqtadī Billāh
4. ‘Abdullāh Ibn Muhammad Ansārī Harawī
5. Abū Tāhir Salafī
6. Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Abū Bakr Shams-ud-Dīn Sarakhsī

THE MUJADDIDĪN OF THE SIXTH CENTURY

1. Muhammad Ibn ‘Umar Abū ‘Abdullāh Fakhr-ud-Dīn Rāzī
2. ‘Alī Ibn Muhammad
3. ‘Izz-ud-Dīn Ibn Kathīr
4. Imām Rāfi’ī, author of Zubdah Sharah Shifā’

5. Yahyā Ibn Habsh Shihāb-ud-Dīn Suharwardī
6. Yahyā Ibn Sharaf An-Nawawī
7. Hafiz ‘Abdur-Rahmān Ibn Jauzī
8. ‘Abdul-Qādir Jilānī

THE MUJADDIDĪN OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY

1. Ahmad Ibn ‘Abdul-Halīm Taqī-ud-Dīn Ibn Taymiyyah
2. Taqī-ud-Dīn Ibn Daqīq Al-‘Īd
3. Sharaf-ud-Dīn Makhdūm Sindhī
4. Mu’īn-ud-Dīn Chishtī
5. Hāfiz Ibn Al-Qayyim Al-Jauziyyah
6. ‘Abdullāh Ibn Sa’d Ibn ‘Alī Yāfi’i
7. Qādī Badr-ud-Dīn Muhammad Ibn ‘Abdullāh Ash-Shiblī

THE MUJADDIDĪN OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY

1. Hāfiz ‘Alī Ibn Hajar ‘Asqalānī
2. Hāfiz Zayn-ud-Dīn ‘Irāqī

3. Sālih Ibn ‘Umar Ibn Arsalān Al-Bulqīnī
4. ‘Allāmah Nāsir-ud-Dīn Shādhilī

THE MUJADDIDĪN OF THE NINTH CENTURY

1. ‘Abdur-Rahmān Ibn Kamāl-ud-Dīn, known as Imām Jalāl-ud-Dīn Suyūṭī
2. Muhammad Ibn ‘Abdur-Rahmān Sakhawī
3. Sayyed Muhammad Jaunpūrī, and Amīr Taymūr according to others

THE MUJADDIDĪN OF THE TENTH CENTURY

1. Mullā ‘Alī Al-Qārī
2. Muhammad Tāhir Patnī
3. ‘Alī Ibn Husām-ud-Dīn, known as ‘Alī Muttaqī Al-Hindī

THE MUJADDIDĪN OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY

1. ‘Ālamgīr
2. Ādam Binnorī
3. Imām Rabbānī Mujaddid Alf-Thānī

THE MUJADDIDĪN OF THE TWELFTH

CENTURY

1. Muhammad Ibn ‘Abdul-Wahhāb Najdī
2. Mirza Mazhar Jān-Jānah Dehlawī
3. Sayyed ‘Abdul-Qādir Ibn Ahmad Hasanī
4. Shah Walīullāh Dehlawī
5. Imām Shaukānī
6. ‘Allāmah Sayyed Muhammad Ibn Ismā’īl Yemenī
7. Muhammad Hayāt Sindhī

THE MUJADDIDĪN OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

1. Sayyed Ahmad Barelwī
2. Shah ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Dehlawī
3. Maulānā Muhammad Ismā’īl Shahīd
4. Shah Rafī-ud-Dīn (according to some scholars)
5. Some have accepted Shah ‘Abdul Qādir. We do not deny that in some countries, there are some pious people that have been accepted as a Mujaddid and we do not have information of it.ⁱ

ⁱ ‘Asal Musaffā vol. 1 pp.162-165

IMPORTANT NOTE

The Qādiyānīs state that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is the Mujaddid of the fourteenth century. In the above list, they have stopped at the thirteenth century because there is still discussion about the fourteenth century. In the light of the deeds of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, who is there who will accept him as a Mujaddid?

Therefore, it is a waste of time to discuss whether he is a Mujaddid or not.

Some of the Mujaddidīn could be:

1. Hakīm-ul-Ummah Maulānā Ashraf ‘Alī Thānwī
2. Maulānā Muhammad Ilyās Kandehlawī

It is not necessary for a Mujaddid to make the claim of being a Mujaddid. It is also not necessary that he has knowledge of himself being the Mujaddid.



CHAPTER THREE

THE TRUTH & FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ

A brief biography of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has passed in Chapter One (1). In this chapter we shall show that through every phase of his life, all his claims were proven to be false. This should be the topic of the Muslim debater and he should be prepared in this line. We present this topic and call for it because it is the one that we stipulate. It is a principle of debate that whichever party presents the topic, they are the claimants. Therefore, we should not give a chance to the Qādiyānī debater to become the claimant. In this topic, the Muslim is the claimant and the Qādiyānī is the respondent. Remember this well.

BEGINNING OF THE DISCUSSION

When starting to speak on this topic, then recite the following verses of the Noble Qur’ān aloud,

﴿فَنَجْعَلْ لَعْنَتَ اللَّهِ عَلَى الْكَاذِبِينَ﴾ آل عمران: ٦١

and then send the curse of Allāh upon the liarsⁱ

﴿وَمَنْ أَظْلَمُ مِمَّنِ افْتَرَىٰ عَلَى اللَّهِ كَذِبًا أَوْ قَالَ أُوحِيَ إِلَيَّ وَلَمْ يُوحَ إِلَيْهِ شَيْءٌ وَمَنْ قَالَ سَأُنْزِلُ
مِثْلَ مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ﴾ الأنعام: ٩٣

*And who can be a greater oppressor than the one who ascribes
a lie to Allāh, or says that revelation has come to him,
whereas no revelation came to himⁱⁱ*

﴿فَمَنْ أَظْلَمُ مِمَّنْ كَذَبَ عَلَى اللَّهِ وَكَذَّبَ بِالصِّدْقِ إِذْ جَاءَهُ﴾ الزمر: ٣٢

*Who can be a greater oppressor than the one who ascribes a
lie to Allāh and denies the truth when it comes to him.ⁱⁱⁱ*

STATEMENTS OF MIRZĀ ABOUT LYING

After reciting these verses a number of times, present a claim of the falsity of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and request the Qādiyānī debater to prove it as true. Immediately after this, inform him of the texts and warnings of regarding lies that come from Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Explain with great fervour that we have established and proven Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī to be a *Dajjāl* and *Kadh-dhāb* and in the light of his own *fatāwā*, he is classified as a *Kadh-dhāb*, hypocrite and *Jahannamī*. A selection of some of

ⁱ Sūrah Āl-‘Imrān: 61

ⁱⁱ Sūrah Al-An’ām: 93

ⁱⁱⁱ Sūrah Az-Zumar: 32

these *fatāwā* are presented below:

1. Speaking lies is nothing less than becoming a *Murtad*.ⁱ
2. There is no worse action in the world in comparison to speaking lies.ⁱⁱ
3. Wilfully speaking lies is like eating stool.ⁱⁱⁱ
4. Not leaving the corpse of lies is the way of dogs, not man.^{iv}
5. The person who speaks lies against Allāh on a daily basis; he makes things up and then says that it is revelation from Allāh that he received, such a person is worse than dogs, pigs and monkeys.^v
6. Even a bastard will be ashamed of speaking lies.^{vi}
7. Curse be upon the one who lies against the book of Allāh, there is no respect or honour for him at all.^{vii}

ⁱ Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.17 p.56

ⁱⁱ Ibid vol.22 p.459

ⁱⁱⁱ Haqīqat-ul-Wahī, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.22 p.215

^{iv} Anjām Ātham, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.11 p.43

^v Addendum to Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah part 5, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.21 p.292

^{vi} Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.2 p.386

^{vii} Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah part 5, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.21 p.21

Start the discussion whilst keeping all the above *fatāwā* of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī in front. Remind all those present that when the *Dajjāl* and liar status of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is proven, then he should be given all these ‘honorary titles’ that are found in his statements. Now we shall discuss the lies of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī in detail.

FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ

FIRST PROOF OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ

‘Look at history, Rasūlullāh ﷺ was the only one whose father passed away a few days after his birth.’ⁱ

This lie of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is so clear that there remains no need to provide further detail. Every person knows that the father of Rasūlullāh ﷺ passed away before his blessed birth. Rasūlullāh ﷺ was born an orphan. Allāh ﷻ says in Sūrah Ad-Duhā, verse 6, ‘did He not find you an orphan and gave you shelter?’ From this, you can gauge the amount of lies that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī speaks about Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

ⁱ Payghām-e-Sulah p.27, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.23 p.465

SECOND PROOF OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ

‘The historians know that there were eleven (11) sons born in the home of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. All of them had passed away.’ⁱ

O Qādiyānīs! Leave the historians; present the writing of a single historian that claimed this. This claim of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is the second clear proof of his falsity. Looking at this, even a person that has a very small amount of intelligence will have conviction that the talks of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī are false.

THIRD PROOF OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ

‘The inspirations of the pious people of before have emphatically stamped upon the fact that he will be born at the start of the fourteenth century. In addition, he will be in Punjab.’ⁱⁱ

In this text, think carefully over the word ‘stamped’. The statements of the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ are definite, i.e. *qat’i*. The statements of the pious can never acquire this

ⁱ Chashma Ma’rifat p.286, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.23 p.299

ⁱⁱ Arba’in p.23 Number 2, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.17 p.371

status; the inspirations that they get are not proof in the *sharī'ah*. Their inspirations are *zannī*, whilst this statement of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī speaks about a *qat'ī* stamp. This word shows that the word *Auliya'* was not there in the original text.ⁱ

The statement of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has the word '*Auliya'*', a *kathrat* plural, i.e. showing more than ten (10). This word also shows time and place. Therefore, this statement of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī can never be true until ten (10) accepted *Auliya'* clarify this from their inspirations and establish that the *Masīh* will be born at the start of the fourteenth century. He should be born in Punjab, not anywhere else. This is a clear lie. Until today, no Qādiyānī can prove this, nor will they ever be able to prove it.

FOURTH PROOF OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ

'Remember that in the Noble Qur'ān, in fact, in some pages of the Taurāt, it is stated that at the time of the

ⁱ In the first edition of *Arba'in*, the word *Ambiyā'* was there. The second edition stated that the word *Auliya'* was there at first and mistakenly *Ambiyā'* was written in place of *Auliya'*. Now, in *Rūhānī Khazā'in* this note has also been removed. This is a clear example of dishonesty upon dishonesty.

promised *Masīh*, there will be a plague. *Masīh* ﷺ had also informed of this in the Injīl.ⁱ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī wrote in the footnote of this text, ‘the occurrence of a plague at the time of the promised *Masīh* is mentioned in the following books of the Bible; Zachariah (14:12) Matthew (22:7), Revelation (22:8).’ⁱⁱ

This lie of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is a conglomeration of four lies. This is because there is no mention of a plague at the time of the promised *Masīh* in the pages of the Noble Qur’ān, the Taurāt and the Injīl. Look at the audacity of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, he names the books and gives incorrect references too. Let us look at some of the references;

‘This is the plague with which the LORD will strike all the nations that fought against Jerusalem: their flesh will rot while they are still standing on their feet, their eyes will rot in their sockets, and their tongues will rot in their mouths.’ⁱⁱⁱ

‘Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. There will be famines and earthquakes in

ⁱ Kashtī Nūh, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.5 p.19

ⁱⁱ Ibid

ⁱⁱⁱ Zachariah (14:12), New International Version

various places.’ⁱ

‘I, John, am the one who heard and saw these things. And when I had heard and seen them, I fell down to worship at the feet of the angel who had been showing them to me.’ⁱⁱ

The falsity of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is clear from the above texts. This is a lie upon three heavenly scriptures, which he has referred to. In these verses, there is no mention of *Masīh* and a plague. This is also a lie against the Noble Qur’ān. It is not mentioned anywhere in the Noble Qur’ān that when *Masīh* ﷺ will come a second time, there will be a plague in his time.

LIES UPON LIES

In defence of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, the Mirzā’is make a far-fetched interpretation and say that in the following verse of the Noble Qur’ān,

﴿وَإِذَا وَقَعَ الْقَوْلُ عَلَيْهِمْ أَخْرَجْنَا لَهُمْ دَابَّةً مِّنَ الْأَرْضِ تُكَلِّمُهُمْ أَنَّ النَّاسَ كَانُوا بِآيَاتِنَا لَا يُوقِنُونَ﴾ النمل: ٨٢

‘When the word will be fulfilled against them, We shall take out for them a strange creature from the world which will speak to them, indeed people do not have conviction in Our

ⁱ Matthew (24:7), New International Version

ⁱⁱ Revelation (22:8), New International Version

*signs*ⁱ

The word ‘creature’ refers to the worm of the plague and ‘speak to them’ means that it will bite the people.

The Qādiyānīs further say that because the creature will come out in the time of the promised *Masīh*, which is why it is correct for Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī to say that it is proven from the Noble Qur’an that there will be a plague during the time of the promised *Masīh*. The text of the accursed Qādiyānī is presented below:

‘The summary is that the creature of the earth that is mentioned in the above verses, that will appear in the time of the promised *Masīh*, it is the same creature of different forms that I saw in the realm of *kashf*, i.e. inspiration. It has been placed in my heart that this is the worm of the plague.’ⁱⁱ

‘What further testimony is required to find out the proper meaning of the creature of the earth, when the Noble Qur’an states in another place that it is a worm. Therefore, going against the Noble Qur’an and adopting another meaning is interpolation, heresy and

ⁱ Sūrah An-Naml: 82

ⁱⁱ Nuzūl-ul-Masīh p.39, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.18 p.416, Lecture of Siyalkot p.48, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.20 p.240

deception.”ⁱ

In reality, this is not an interpretation of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and the Mirzā’is, it is nothing but falsehood upon falsehood. Firstly, it is a lie. Then more lies were spoken to make it seem true. The adage rings true, ‘One has to speak a thousand lies for one lie’. The interpretation is so false that there is nothing that can be written further to tear it apart. However, in order to recognize the reality, a few guidelines will be given:

1. In accordance to the *Tafsīr* standard of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, no *Mufasssir*, *Mubaddith* or Mujaddid in the history of Islām has explained the meaning of creature to be ‘worm’. Therefore, this explanation of the verse is not worthy of acceptance.
2. Even if this fabricated explanation is correct, where does one find the promised *Masīh* mentioned in the verse? Therefore, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī remains a liar in his claim.
3. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has given different explanations of this verse. In his book, *Izālat-ul-Auhām*, he writes, ‘When the word will be fulfilled against them, We shall take out for them a strange creature from the world which will speak to them, indeed people do not have conviction in Our signs’ i.e. when such a

ⁱ Nuzūl-ul-Masīh p.40, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.18 p.418

day will come wherein punishment will fall upon the disbelievers and their destined time will come close, then we shall take out a group (creature of the earth) from the earth. They will be the *Mutakallimīn*, those who attacked all the false religions in support of Islām.ⁱ

In this very same book, in another place, he explains the meaning of ‘creature of the earth’ and says, ‘Similarly, ‘creature of the earth’, i.e. the scholars and lecturers who do not have any heavenly strength in them. This has been continuing from the beginning. However, the purport of the Qur’ān is that during the end times, they will be an abundance of them, beyond limits and the meaning of their coming out is their abundance.’ⁱⁱ

In *Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā*, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī says that ‘creature of the earth’ refers to the evil scholars; not those who attack the false religions in support of Islām. He writes,

‘Indeed the meaning of ‘creature of the earth’ is the evil scholars that testify with their statements that the Rasūl and the Qur’ān is true, and then do evil deeds. They serve *Dajjāl*....They have been named ‘creature of the earth’ because they have inclined to the world and have

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Auhām vol. 2, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.3 p.370

ⁱⁱ Izālat-ul-Auhām vol.2, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.3 p.373

not given consideration for the hereafter.’ⁱ

The summary of these texts is that according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, the ‘creature of the earth’ has three meanings:

1. Well-versed *Mutakallimīn*
2. Evil scholars and lecturers
3. The worm of the plague

Now, there is contradiction in the words of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Bear in mind that according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, contradiction can only come about in the speech of a mad person, an ignorant person and a hypocrite.ⁱⁱ

Therefore, the verse about the ‘creature of the earth’ does not become a proof for him, it is another sign of the deviation of the Mirzā’īs. All praise is for Allāh.

With regards to the descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has resorted to interpolation

ⁱ Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.7 p.308

ⁱⁱ In Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.10 p.142, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes, ‘However, it is clear that there can never be contradiction in the speech of an intelligent and clean hearted human being. Yes, if there is a mad person, an insane man, or such a hypocrite that says yes to everything. Indeed the work of such a person becomes contradictory.’



and deception by taking the meaning to be ‘worm of the plague’. In the above quoted references, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī stated that the meaning of ‘creature of the earth’ is the scholars and lecturers. From this we learn that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has resorted to interpolation, deception and heresy. Rasūlullāh ﷺ has spoken the truth and said that whoever claims *Nubuwwat* after him will be a *Dajjāl*.



FIFTH PROOF OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ


‘Our Nabī ﷺ did not acquire outward knowledge from any teacher, just like the other *Ambiyā*’. However, ‘Īsā (ﷺ) and Mūsā (ﷺ) would sit in primary *Maktab*s and ‘Īsā (ﷺ) learnt the entire Taurāt from a Jewish teacher...the one who will come has been named Mahdī. In this there is indication that the one to come will acquire knowledge of religion from the divine. He will not be the student of anyone in Qur’ān and Hadīth. I can tell the *khulafā*’ that this condition is my condition. No one can prove that I learnt a lesson in Qur’ān, Hadīth or *Tafsīr* from any human being. Alternatively, that I became the student of any *Mufasssir* or *Muhaddith*.’ⁱ



In this text, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has cooked

ⁱ Ayyām As-Sulah p.147, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.14 p.394

up two lies and has falsely accused two great *Ambiyā'*, viz. Sayyidunā Mūsā  and Sayyidunā 'Īsā . The reasons are detailed forthwith;

Firstly, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has accepted that *Ambiyā'*  do not have any human teacher or tutor; they acquire their knowledge from Allāh . *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* states, 'And He taught and nurtured the pure souls, i.e. the *Ambiyā'*, without the medium of any teacher or tutor, and made them the sign of His eternal munificence.'ⁱ

Secondly, before the birth of Sayyidunā 'Īsā , when his mother was given glad tidings of his birth, it was clarified to her, 'and He will teach him the book and wisdom and the Taurāt and the Injīl.'ⁱⁱ He will not learn from any human being.

Similarly, on the Day of *Qiyāmah*, Allāh  will tell Sayyidunā 'Īsā  of His favours and say, 'Remember when I taught you the book, wisdom, the Taurāt and the Injīl.'ⁱⁱⁱ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī denies these clear texts of the Noble Qur'ān and falsely accuses Sayyidunā 'Īsā

ⁱ Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.1 p.16

ⁱⁱ Sūrah Āl-'Imrān

ⁱⁱⁱ Sūrah Al-Mā'idah

ﷺ, saying that he learnt the Taurāt from a Jewish teacher. We seek the protection of Allāh.

Is this not a clear lie? Does the accusation of going against His promise not fall on Allāh ﷻ? If Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ learnt the Taurāt from a Jewish teacher according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, then on the Day of *Qiyāmah*, how will Allāh ﷻ say that He taught the Taurāt to Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ? Will Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ not say, ‘O Allāh, when did You teach the Taurāt to me? I learnt it from a Jewish teacher.’ It is not proven that Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ and Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ studied in any primary *Maktab*. This is an accusation and lie against two great *Ambiyā’*. If the Mirzā’is have any courage, they should present their proofs for this.

USELESS ATTEMPT

The Mirzā’is start to make interpretations for the above mentioned lies and make great effort to try and prove them as true facts. They say that the teachers in front of whom Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ and Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ studied refer to the outer words of the Qur’ān and Hadīth. Where learning from the *Ambiyā’* is negated, it refers to learning the deep and intricate points and meanings, as these are taught only by Allāh ﷻ. They had no worldly teacher in this matter.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE MIRZĀ'IS IS WRONG & USELESS FOR A NUMBER OF REASONS

1. It is not proven for Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ and Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ that they had a human teacher, whereas Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had not one human teacher, but many human teachers.

2. In the above quoted text, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made a similitude of himself to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. In this similitude, he states that he had no worldly teacher. Therefore, if it is proven that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had a teacher that taught him the apparent words, then the similitude will be wrong and Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī will be proven to be a liar and imposter.

3. The specification is incorrect where it is stated that 'not studying' refers to not studying or reading the deeper meanings and implications. This is because Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī claimed that he did not study three things.

(i) The Noble Qur'ān

(ii) Hadīth

(iii) *Tafsīr*

In Hadīth and *Tafsīr* a person reads and studies

meanings and purport only. Therefore, from this we learn that he negates studying the words and the meanings. Hence, even if it is proven that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī learnt the apparent words only from a teacher, then too, there remains no doubt in his claims being false.

4. Making the interpretation of ‘meanings’ is not permitted according to the clear text of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. This is because he has taken an oath in this particular text and gave the explanation.

AN IMPORTANT PRINCIPLE

Whatever is uttered under oath, only the apparent meaning can be taken.ⁱ No exclusion or interpretation can be used in it. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī explained personally explained this principle.

والقسم يدل على أن الخبر محمول على الظاهر لا تأويل فيه ولا إستثناء وإلا
فأى فائدة كانت في ذكر القسم؟

Taking an oath and saying something indicates that the apparent wording will be taken into consideration; no interpretation or exclusion will apply to it, otherwise,

ⁱ This is a very important principle, one should memorize it. One will require it in the section of ‘*Nuzūl-ul-Masīh*’.

what is the benefit of taking the oath?ⁱ

In the light of this principle, there remains no scope or room at all for any type of interpretation or exclusion in the above mentioned text of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Therefore, it is a futile activity to go into discussion on it. The apparent meaning should be taken, which is the demand of the oath.

SIXTH PROOF OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ

‘Similarly, it is mentioned in the authentic Hadīth that the promised Messiah will come at the start of the century. He will be the *Mujaddid* of the fourteenth century. So all these signs will be fulfilled in this time too.’ⁱⁱ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes in *Kitāb-ul-Bariyyah*,

‘Many of the inspired persons (*Ahl-Kashf*) have stated after receiving inspiration (*Ilhām*) from Allāh ﷻ that the promised Messīah will emerge in the beginning of the fourteenth century. Although this prediction has been mentioned briefly in the Noble Qur’ān, however it has been mentioned with such *Tawātur* in the Ahādīth

ⁱ Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.7 p.192

ⁱⁱ Addendum to Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah vol.5 p.187, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.21 p.359

that the mind finds it impossible to be false.”ⁱ

In these texts and texts similar to them, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has spoken two clear lies. The first is that the inspired persons have said that the promised Messīah will emerge in the beginning of the fourteenth century, whilst the reality is that such a statement has not been narrated from any of the pious elders. The second is that it is mentioned in the authentic Ahādīth that the promised Messiah will emerge in the fourteenth century. This is an open lie. The Mirzā’is cannot present a single authentic Hadīth that has this subject matter in it until (the day of) *Qiyāmah*. It is our claim that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has attributed a false Hadīth towards Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and he has been bold and fearless in making *Jahannam* his abode. Rasūlullāh ﷺ has said,

من كذب علي متعمداً فليتبوأ مقعده من النار

*The person who intentionally makes a false attribution towards me should prepare his abode in the fire.*ⁱⁱ

Challenge: We have been making this challenge from a long time that if any Qādiyānī can present a single Hadīth in which Rasūlullāh ﷺ has made mention of

ⁱ Kitāb-ul-Bariyyah, footnote Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.13 pp.205- 206

ⁱⁱ Mishkāṭ, Bāb-ul-‘Ilm vol.1 p. 35

the fourteenth century, then he will receive a prize of his choice. Is there any brave Mirzā'ī who would present a single Hadīth and obtain the prize, and prove Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī to be correct?

SEVENTH PROOF OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ

'If there is reliance on the words of the Hadīth, then practice should first be on the Ahādīth that are more authentic than this Hadīth, for example; the Ahādīth of *Sahīh Al-Bukhārī* wherein information is given about some of the *Khulafā'* of the final era, specifically the *Khalīfah* regarding whom it is stated in *Sahīh Al-Bukhārī* that a sound will come from the skies regarding him, هذا خليفة الله المهدي (This is the *Khalīfah* of Allāh, Mahdī). Now think, what is the position of this Hadīth, which is mentioned in the most authentic book after the book of Allāh (the Noble Qur'ān)?ⁱ

It is a complete lie that this Hadīth is recorded in *Sahīh Al-Bukhārī*. This Hadīth is not found in the entire *Sihāb-Sittah*. May the curse of Allāh ﷻ be on the liars.

THE INTELLIGENT ONE

Upon seeing this lie, to do away with the disgrace, the

ⁱ Shahādāt-ul-Qur'ān vol.6 p.337

Mirzā'is present a few weak answers. A Muslim debater should not be unmindful of these answers. We present the answers and the answers to the answers below.

1. Although the Hadīth *هذا خليفة الله المهدي* is not recorded in *Sahīh Al-Bukhārī*, but it is recorded in another book of Hadīth, *Kanz-ul-'Ummāl*. Therefore, the claim of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is correct.

Answer to the answer: This answer is like, 'strike the knee and the eye would burst'. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī claims that it is a Hadīth of *Sahīh Al-Bukhārī*. Therefore, how would the claim be correct if the Hadīth is found in *Kanz-ul-'Ummāl* or any other book of Hadīth?

2. It is a mistake of the scribe. He erred by writing *Sahīh Al-Bukhārī* in place of *Kanz-ul-'Ummāl*.

Response to the Answer: Granted that it is an error of the scribe, then (what about) the words mentioned ahead 'the most authentic book etc', so according to the Mirzā'is is *Kanz-ul-'Ummāl* also the most authentic book after the book of Allāh ﷻ together with *Sahīh Al-Bukhārī*? If it is such, then furnish the proof for it. We say that there can be no greater lie than this.

3. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī stated this in

forgetfulness.

Response to the Answer: Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made this statement in 1893 C.E. Thereafter he remained alive for approximately fifteen (15) years. Did he not realise during his lifetime what he wrote in forgetfulness? He made no apology for this, whilst it is a unanimous belief of the *Ahl-us-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah* that a true messenger cannot remain upon something that he did in forgetfulness.ⁱ

EIGHTH PROOF OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ

‘We come to know from the books of all the *Ambiyā'* and similarly from the Noble Qur'ān that from Sayyidūnā ‘Ādam ﷺ right until the end, Allāh ﷻ has kept the existence of the world for seven thousand

ⁱ The Mirzā's also say that so and so scholar has cited so and so Hadīth from *Sahīh Al-Bukhārī* which does not appear in it. Therefore, it is not a big issue if Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī also made this mistake. The decisive answer to this would be that no scholar besides Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made the claim that the angelic nature of *Rūh-ul-Qudus* is always in operation in the powers of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. (‘Ā'inah Kamālāt-Islām vol.5 p.93) It is astonishing that such a great lie emanated from Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī despite *Rūh-ul-Qudus* always being with him.

(7000) years.”ⁱ

‘It is also clearly apparent from the Noble Qur’ān that from Sayyidūnā Ādam ﷺ right until the end, the age of the children of Ādam is seven thousand (7000) years. Similarly, all the previous books say the same thing with unanimity.”ⁱⁱ

This is a complete lie. This is a clear false accusation on the Noble Qur’ān, all the heavenly books and the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ. It is not established from any Nabī that the world would exist for seven thousand (7000) years. In fact, all the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ are unanimous that no one besides Allāh ﷻ has the correct knowledge of *Qiyāmah*. No one besides Allāh ﷻ has the correct knowledge of the century in which *Qiyāmah* will occur.

The Noble Qur’ān has clarified this in a number of places. If they have shame and a little bit of *īmān* in them, then they should establish (their claim) from a Nabī or heavenly book through a correct source.

NINTH PROOF OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ

The falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī being

ⁱ Lecture Siyalkot vol.20 p.207

ⁱⁱ Lecture Siyalkot vol.20 p.209

presented here is so great that it outweighs all his previous lies. This lie of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī should be presented with full force in the gatherings of the common people so that it becomes evident to every Muslim that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is a *Dajjāl*. The lie is, ‘three cities have been mentioned with honour in the Noble Qur’ān; Makkah, Madinah, Qadiyan.’ⁱ

Every reciter of the Noble Qur’ān is aware that the word Qadiyan does not appear in the Noble Qur’ān. Yes, if Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has another Qur’ān that was revealed from *Shaytān*, then it is a separate matter. We have nothing to do with it. In fact, it would be an additional proof to the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

TENTH PROOF OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ

In one place, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has made the claim with great force,

وقد سبوني بكل سب فما رددت عليهم جوابهم

They (the ‘Ulamā’) have said to me all types of ill words.

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām p. 34

*However, I did not give them an answer.*ⁱ

We say that this claim of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is a complete lie and a fabrication. He has personally admitted, ‘I admit that I have been somewhat harsh in my writings against my opponents. However, it is not an initiation of harshness. In fact, the writings are a response to severe attacks (that were made).’ⁱⁱ

This text clearly refutes the claim of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, which is that he never responded to an opponent.

We will now present a short list of the verbal abuses of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. One can easily gauge from it that not only was Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī a liar; he was also ill-mannered and foul-mouthed.

ANOTHER ANGLE OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ

THE TEACHINGS OF MIRZĀ IN TERMS OF CHARACTER & CONDUCT

Ambiyā’ ﷺ are not foul-mouthed. Being foul-mouthed

ⁱ Mawāhib-ur-Rahmān vol.19 p.236

ⁱⁱ Kitāb-ul-Bariyyah p.10

is contrary to human honour. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself writes,

1. 'Allāh ﷻ is the one who sent his messenger, i.e. this weak one, with good character.'ⁱ
2. 'Verbal abuse and foul language is not an honourable way.'ⁱⁱ
3. 'Do not hurl verbal abuses to anyone even though he may be hurling verbal abuses.'
4. 'Experience bears testimony to the fact that the fate of foul-mouthed persons would not be good. Allāh ﷻ' s sense of honour manifests itself in the end for His loved ones. There is no knife that is worse than the knife of foul-language.'ⁱⁱⁱ
5. *'Give Du'ās upon hearing foul language, provide comfort upon suffering distress*

Show humility when you see pride^{iv}

Now take a look at the verbal abuses of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and observe the contradiction between

ⁱ Arba'īn number 3 p.36

ⁱⁱ Addendum to Arba'īn number four p.5, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.17 p.471

ⁱⁱⁱ Peghām-Sulh p.15, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.23 pp.386-387

^{iv} Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah vol.5 p.114

his words and actions.

A FEW EXAMPLES OF THE FOUL LANGUAGE OF MIRZĀ

1. ‘O Maulwīs of the evil group, until when will you conceal the truth? When will the time come that you leave the trait of the Jews? O oppressive Maulwīs, shame on you that you have also given the masses to drink the same cup of dishonesty from which you drank.’ⁱ
2. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes in reply to the well-known scholar, Maulānā ‘Abd-ul-Haqq Ghaznawī,

‘However, you have eaten this iguana of lies to conceal the truth.’

He writes further,

‘O evil wicked enemy of Allāh and (His) Rasūl’ⁱⁱ

He addresses Maulānā (‘Abd-ul-Haqq Ghaznawī) in another place and says,

‘O evil person with the trait of the Jews, the priests were disgraced and you too (were

ⁱ Anjām Ātham p.19

ⁱⁱ Addendum to Anjām Ātham vol.11 p. 334

disgraced). A heavenly curse befell the priests and it also befell you.”ⁱ

3. He prattles about the general ‘*Ulamā*’ who are against him,

‘For the Jews, Allāh mentioned the example of a donkey with books laden on it. However these (‘*Ulamā*’) are only donkeys. They are also deprived of the honour that books be laden on them.”ⁱⁱ

4. إن العدا صاروا خنازير الفلا

ونسأؤهم من دونهن الأكلب

Our enemies have become the swine of the jungle

And their women have surpassed bitches

5. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī broke all records when he hurled verbal abuses at Maulānā Sa’d-ullāh Ludhiyānwī,

وَمِنَ اللَّئَامِ أَرَى رُجِيلاً فَاسِقاً غَوَلاً لَعِيناً نُطْفَةَ السُّفْهَاءِ

From amongst the mean peopleⁱⁱⁱ, I see one

ⁱ Addendum Anjām Ātham p.315

ⁱⁱ Addendum Anjām Ātham p.316, 317

ⁱⁱⁱ In the footnotes of these couplets, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has written, ‘these couplets were written with a genuine intention

*transgressor that he is an accursed Shaytān, an
offspring of the foolish*

شَكِسَ خَبِيثٌ مُفْسِدٌ وَ مُزَوَّرٌ نَحْسٌ يُسَمَّى السَّعْدُ فِي الْجُهْلَاءِ

*He is a slanderer, an evil person, mischievous, and
one who beautifies lies and shows them. He is ill-
fated, the one whom the ignorant people have named
Sa'd-ullāh*

أَذَيْتَنِي خُبْنًا فَلَسْتُ بِصَادِقٍ إِنْ لَمْ تَمُتْ بِالْخِزْيِ يَا ابْنَ بَغَاءِ

*You have hurt me greatly through your wickedness. I
would not be true if you do not die a disgraceful
death, (O the son of a prostitute)ⁱ*

when the foul-language of the ill-fated Sa'd-ullāh surpassed all bounds'. (Tatimmah Haqīqat-ul-Wahī vol.22 p.445) This footnote of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is a clear proof to the fact that he did respond to his opponents. Establishment of the point that he did respond to his opponents is sufficient to make him a liar and a *Dajjāl*.

ⁱ The translation in brackets is not the translation of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. In fact, this translation has been made according to the clear writings of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī at different places. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has translated these couplets into Persian in *Anjām Ātham* on page 282.

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes in his book *Nūr-ul-Haq*,

‘واعلم أن كل من هو من ولد الحلال و ليس من ذرية البغايا و نسل الدجال’

6. ‘However, would these people take an oath? Never (would they take an oath), because they are liars and they are eating the carrion of lies like dogs.’ⁱ
7. ‘Some ignorant people, the ostriches of the spirituality and scholarship’ⁱⁱ

This is a glimpse into the verbal abuses of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Every one of these verbal abuses testifies to the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. These verbal abuses are worthy of being presented to the Mirzā’īs as a gift. They should also not hesitate in accepting them, because they are the heavenly revelations of their Hadrat Sāhib (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī). In fact, they are the prayers of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, because his teachings are,

‘Give Du’ās upon hearing foul language, provide comfort

‘Know well that every person who is a legitimate offspring and not from the offspring of a prostitute and the progeny of Dajjāl’ (Nūr-ul-Haq vol.8 p.163)

It is also the demand of the Arabic language that the word بَغَايا be translated as prostitute. Therefore, no interpretation of the Mirzā’īs will be heard in this regard.

ⁱ Addendum to Anjām Ātham vol.11 p.309

ⁱⁱ Anjām Ātham vol.12 p.302

upon suffering distress

Show humility when you see pride'

TAKE NOTE

When the discussion takes place on the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, then the Mirzā'is cleverly divert the direction of the discussion. May Allāh ﷻ protect us, they say, 'Sayyidūnā Ibrāhīm ﷺ also spoke three lies. What is the big fuss if Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī spoke lies?' Therefore, a few points should be remembered in this regard.

1. The lies of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī are lies in reality. There is no room for any interpretation, whilst the speech of Sayyidūnā Ibrāhīm ﷺ was from the category of veiled reference (*Ta'rīdh*) and double meaning (*Tawriyyah*). The onlooker understood it to be a lie, (whilst in reality) Sayyidūnā Ibrāhīm ﷺ did not speak a lie, just as the commentators of Hadīth have clarified it. Therefore, it is never correct to do deductive reasoning (*Qiyās*) upon the matter of Sayyidūnā Ibrāhīm ﷺ for the impure Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.
2. In one of his writings, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself has objected to those who have termed the speech of Sayyidūnā Ibrāhīm ﷺ as a

lie. He referred to them as wicked *Shaytāns* and impure matter.

‘What else can be said regarding the person who says that the reason for my suspicion on Sayyidinā Ibrāhīm (ﷺ) is his utterances of lies, that his nature is different from the nature of those pure personalities. The substance and composition of this impure person conforms to the nature of *Shaytān*.’ⁱ

The Mirzā’is should (first) weigh themselves in front of this writing of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and then speak.

ANOTHER ANGLE OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ: FALSE PROPHECIES

Let us first take a look at the principles of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī in relation to prophecies.

1. ‘For a person to be false in his prophecies is in itself the greatest disgrace.’ⁱⁱ
2. ‘It should be clear to those people who have bad thoughts (about us) that our prophecies are the

ⁱ Ā’inah Kamālāt-Islām vol.5 p.598

ⁱⁱ Tiryāq Qalb p.217

greatest test to examine our truth or falsehood.”ⁱ

3. ‘Postponements are not possible in the prophecies of the *Ambiyā’*.”ⁱⁱ

In light of these three principles of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, if we prove any one of his prophecies to be false, then automatically it would mean that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is a liar and a *Dajjāl*. Upon commencing this discussion, we should first recite loudly this verse of the Noble Qur’ān,

﴿فَلَا تَحْسَبَنَّ اللَّهَ مُخْلِفَ وَعْدِهِ رُسُلَهُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَزِيزٌ ذُو انتِقَامٍ﴾ إبراهيم: ٤٧

*Never think that Allāh will break His promise to His messengers. Indeed Allāh is Mighty, Able to take vengeance.*ⁱⁱⁱ

PLOT OF THE MIRZĀ’IS

It is the special habit of the Mirzā’is to build up a narrative on certain points to deceive the masses. Some of these points are accepted whilst others are only for their objective. In this way, they operate in a deceptive manner and lead the masses astray. They have also adopted this method in relation to prophecies. They presented three points in front of the people.

ⁱ Ā’inah Kamālāt-Islām p.288

ⁱⁱ Kashtī Nūh p.5

ⁱⁱⁱ Sūrah Ibrāhīm: 47

1. The prophecy of a Nabī cannot be false.
2. A person whose prophecy is false cannot be a Nabī.
3. A person whose prophecy turns out to be true is a Nabī.

The first two points are acceptable. However, the final point is absurd and it is a deception, because it is not necessary if a person's prophecy sometimes turns out to be true, then he is a Nabī. The prophecies of many soothsayers and astrologers turn out to be correct. So, are they all Nabīs?

The following three points should be presented to further clarify this deception of the Mirzā'is.

A.

1. A Nabī does not learn how to read and write from anyone.
2. The one who learns how to read and write is cannot be a Nabī. However, it is not necessary that the one who does not learn how to read and write from anyone is a Nabī.

B.

1. A Nabī does not author books.
2. The one who authors books cannot be a Nabī.

However, it is not necessary that the one who does not author books is a Nabī.

C.

1. A Nabī cannot be a poet.
2. The one who is a poet is not a Nabī. However, it is not necessary that every non-poet is a Nabī.

In the same manner, if someone's prophecy coincidentally turns out to be true, then it would never necessitate that he is a Nabī or he is commanded from the side of Allāh ﷻ. It is no proof of being true. Yes, even if a single prophecy of a person turns out to be false, then it is certain that such a person can never be commanded from the side of Allāh ﷻ, because it is contrary to the way of Allāh ﷻ to go against a promise made to a Rasūl.

Therefore, we will now present a few false prophecies of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, which will prove that his falsehood in light of his own stated principles and it will become evident that he is a great liar.

﴿فَلَا تَحْسَبَنَّ اللَّهَ مُخْلِفَ وَعْدِهِ رُسُلَهُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَزِيزٌ ذُو انتِقَامٍ﴾ إبراهيم: ٤٧

*Never think that Allāh will break His promise to His messengers.
Indeed Allāh is Mighty, Able to take vengeance.*

FIRST FALSE PROPHECY

In 1893 C.E, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had a debate with the Christians in Amritsar. The debate lasted for fifteen (15) days. When Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī lost the debate, to do away with the disgrace, he issued a threatening prophecy about the Christian debater, deputy ‘Abdullāh Ātham. He said, ‘for the number of days the debate lasted, within months equal to it, he (‘Abdullāh Ātham) would fall into hell (*Hāwiyah*) and be destroyed. If he remains alive, then I am a liar.’ The words of the prophecy are,

‘That which opened up to me tonight when I made *du’ā* with great humility to Allāh ﷻ that You should make a decision in this matter and we are weak servants. Nothing can be done besides Your decision. (Allāh ﷻ) gave me this sign as a glad tiding that the group that is intentionally speaking lies and it has forsaken the true lord and it has made a weak human its lord, that within the days equal to the debate, i.e. one (1) day equal to one month, i.e. it (that group) would be dropped into *Hāwiyah* in fifteen (15) months and it would be disgraced badly, on the condition that it does not turn towards the truth. The one who is upon the truth and believes in the true lord, he would be honoured through it. When this prophecy will become manifest, some blind persons would gain sight, some crippled persons would begin to walk and some deaf persons would begin

to hear. I proclaim at this point that if this prophecy turns out to be false, i.e. the group that is upon falsehood according to Allāh, if it does not reach *Hāwiyah* within fifteen (15) months from today (5 June 1893 C.E) through the punishment of death, then I am ready to accept any punishment. I would be disgraced and my face blackened. A rope should be placed on my neck. I should be hanged. I am ready for anything. I take an oath upon Allāh ﷻ and say that certainly he will do such. Certainly He will do it, certainly He will do it. The sky and the earth can move. However, His decree will not change.ⁱ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī wrote this prophecy on 5 June 1893 C.E. Accordingly, fifteen (15) months would be on 5 September 1894 C.E. However, 5 September (1894 C.E) passed and not even the hair of ‘Abdullāh Ātham was askew. The Christians celebrated to such an extent that in (the place) Batala, ‘Abdullāh Ātham was made to sit on an elephant and a procession of grand victory was taken out. An effigy of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was made and a rope was placed on the neck. He was then artificially hanged to death and the effigy was then set-alight.

To sum it up, this prophecy of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad

ⁱ Jang Muqaddas p.209-211, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.6 pp.291-293

Qādiyānī proved to be completely incorrect and false, and he was disgraced through his own pen. A person whose prophecy is false cannot be a Nabī or one who is commanded from the side of Allāh ﷺ. Therefore, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī proved to be a great liar in these claims of his.

AN ASHAMED CAT CLAWS AT THE LAMPPOST

When this prophecy turned out to be a clear proof of the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, he became concerned that it should not expose the deception. Therefore, to keep his grip on his followers, he made another surprising statement. He said that the prophecy was not fulfilled because ‘Abdullāh Ātham retracted from calling Rasūlullāh ﷺ a *Dajjāl* in front of sixty (60) to seventy (70) people.ⁱ Therefore, one should remember the following three answers to prove the absurdness of this futile endeavour for all to see.

Answer 1:

It was stated earlier that according to the principles of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, there is no room for any interpretation or exception in a statement made

ⁱ Check Haqīqat-ul-Wahī on the footnotes of Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.22 p. 216

under oath. This prophecy of his has an oath in it. Therefore, according to the principles of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, it is completely incorrect to make any interpretation in this regard.

Answer 2:

If Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī came to know from before that (‘Abdullāh) Ātham had retracted from his statement and the prophecy would no longer be fulfilled, then he should have announced it so that he would not be disgraced later. However, where would he make the announcement? He continued to pray, lamenting right until the final day and he made his followers recite special litanies that (‘Abdullāh) Ātham should die and the prophecy should be fulfilled. A Hadīth of his is stated in *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī*,

‘In the name of Allāh, the Most Kind, the Most Merciful. Miyā ‘Abdullāh Sinnūrī related to me that when there remained only one day for the appointed time of Ātham, the promised *Masīh* said to me and Miyā Hāmid ‘Ālī Marhūm, take so many chickpeas (I do not remember the number of chickpeas he said) and recite the special litany of so and so Sūrah on it this number of times (I do not remember the number). Miyā ‘Abdullāh says, I do not remember the Sūrah. However, I do remember that it was a short Sūrah similar to *Alam Tara (Sūrah Al-Fīl)*. We spent almost

the entire night to complete this special litany.ⁱ

The deduction is that had Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī known that (‘Abdullāh) Ātham turned towards the truth, then what was the need for the special litanies of the entire night? This vigilance and lamentation is a clear proof that even according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, ‘Abdullāh Ātham remained upon his previous beliefs until the final night of the stipulated date. Had he died before this date then Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī would have over-elaborated it to the extent that there would be tumult in the entire world.

Answer 3:

When the objection was made on the second *Khalīfah* of the Mirzā’īs, Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd, that his prayers are not accepted, he provided a superb response that even caused his father, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī to drown. Accordingly, he published an explanation in *Akbbār-ul-Fasl* on 20 June 1940 C.E, the words of which are,

‘We are all aware what the condition of (our) group was at the time of the prophecy on (‘Abdullāh) Ātham. I was a small child at that time. I was five and a half years old. However, I can clearly remember that scene, that

ⁱ Sīrat-ul-Mahdī vol.1 p.159, 160 Hadīth 156

when the final day of the prophecy of Ātham arrived, *du'ā* was made in great distress and anxiety. I did not even find the mourning (*mātam*) of Muharram to be so severe. The promised Messiah was very busy in *du'ā* on one side.'

This means that they made *du'ā* with great humility. However, it still did not receive acceptance and ('Abdullāh) Ātham did not die on the stipulated time. Why would there then be an objection upon me?

We come to know that the statement of the Mirzā'is that ('Abdullāh) Ātham retracted (from his position) is nothing except that 'an ashamed cat claws at the lamppost '. This prophecy became a clear sign to the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, which cannot be wiped out.

ANOTHER RUSE

When the prophecy did not turn out to be true on the appointed time and 'Abdullāh Ātham did not die, he made lots of propaganda against the Qādiyānīs. In response, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī played a trick and made the announcement that 'Abdullāh Ātham had sincerely retracted (from his position). If he did not retract, then he should take an oath.ⁱ It is not

ⁱ Kitāb-ul-Bariyyah vol.13 p.196

permissible for Christians to take an oath. Therefore, if he (‘Abdullāh Ātham) would take an oath, then Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī would have said that this priest is out of the fold of Christianity and if he would not take an oath, then the claim of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī would be established. In this manner, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī tried to take benefit from both angles. However, Ātham provided the following response.

A TIT FOR TAT RESPONSE

‘Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is a representative of the Muslims and he calls himself a Muslim. However, the scholars of Islām call him a disbeliever (*kāfir*). Now, I have no conviction in him being a Muslim. Therefore, I will have conviction if he consumes pork. Now, just as it was difficult to prove that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was Muslim or remained a Muslim through the ingestion of pork, in the same manner, it was difficult for ‘Abdullāh Ātham to take an oath. This was a tit for tat response. Had he (‘Abdullāh Ātham) become fearful, then what was the need for the special litanies and *du’ās*?

SECOND FALSE PROPHECY

Likhrām was a Hindu pundit. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī would often have debates with him. Once

when Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī became tired of him, he issued the following prophecy about him,

‘If within six (6) years from today, a punishment does not afflict this person that is different from general difficulties and is extraordinary, and it comprises of the grandeur of Allāh, then understand that I am not (commanded) from Allāh ﷻ and I do not speak through His spirit. If I am found to be false in this prophecy, then I am ready to accept any punishment. I am happy that a rope be placed on my neck and I be hanged.’ⁱ

Within six (6) months of this prophecy Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī through his disciple had Pundit Likhram killed with a knife. He made it famous that the prophecy turned out to be true, whilst in reality the prophecy did not manifest itself in the way he stated. This reason being that he said Pundit Likhram would die an extraordinary death and he defined it as a punishment that had no similitudeⁱⁱ, whilst the reality is that it is common to be killed by a knife. How could it be referred to as extraordinary? Therefore, the prophecy remained false.

ⁱ Tiryāq-ul-Qulūb p.107

ⁱⁱ Check Haqīqat-ul-Wahī p.196

THE CUNNING & FALSE SPEECH OF MIRZĀ GHULĀM AHMAD QĀDIYĀNĪ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself also knew about the falsehood of his prophecies. Therefore, after the murder of Līkhrām, he acted in a very cunning manner when he added the word ‘knife’ in the text of the prophecy in his book *Nūzūl-ul-Masīh*. The text is,

‘The body of the person you see in this picture, he was a Hindu and an enemy of Islām. In his book, he prophesised about me that this person would die within three (3) years from cholera. I also prophesised about him that he would be killed with a knife within six (6) years.’ⁱ

Decide for yourself, was this a prophecy or did he provide information of an event that would occur?

Challenge:

If anyone can show that the word ‘knife’ was stated in the prophecy before the murder of Līkhrām then he would receive a prize of his choice.

PROPHECY OF LĪKHRĀM

As compared to the prophecy of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, the prophecy of Līkhrām turned out to be

ⁱ Nūzūl-ul-Masīh p.75

true to a great extent when he said that ‘Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī would die within three (3) years from cholera’. This reason being that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī did die from cholera. The Mirzā’is will say that the prophecy was false because Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī did not die within three (3) years. However, it could be said that the actual prophecy was that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī would die from cholera, which turned out to be true. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī did die from cholera.ⁱ As for the time period of the prophecy, then in the words of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī there could be a figurative meaning (*isti’ārah*) implied in it (a prophecy). Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī states in the incident of Sultan Muhammad (the husband of Muhammadi Begum and the son-in-law of Ahmad Baig) that he would pass away within two and a half years. When he did not pass away after two and a half years, then Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made the clarification,

‘I repeatedly say that the actual prophecy about the son-in-law of Ahmad Baig is the inevitable decree (*Taqdīr-Mubram*). Wait for it. If I am a liar, then this prophecy will not be fulfilled and I will die. If I am truthful, then Allāh ﷻ will certainly fulfil it, just as the prophecies of Ahmad Baig and Ātham were fulfilled. The original

ⁱ Sīrat-ul-Mahdī vol.1 p.11, Hayāt-Nāsir p.14

claim is the actual meaning (of the prophecy). As for the time period, sometimes the figurative meaning is also implied.ⁱ

To sum it all, when the figurative meaning (*isti'ārah*) is accepted for time periods, then in the prophecy of Likhram, the period of three (3) years would be regarded as a figurative expression. The objective was the actual prophecy itself.

THIRD FALSE PROPHECY

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī prophesised that he would die in Makkah or Madīnah.ⁱⁱ It is our claim that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī did not even have the honour to visit Makkah and Madīnah. He was disgraced and was found to be a liar through his prophecy. Read the following,

‘Doctor Mīr Muhammad Ismā’īl Sāhib related to me that the promised Messiah did not perform *Hajj*, did not make *I'tikāf*, did not discharge *Zakāh* and did not keep a *Tasbīh*. He refused to eat an iguana in front of me.’ⁱⁱⁱ

ⁱ Anjām Ātham on the footnotes of Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.11 p.31

ⁱⁱ Al-Bushrā p.155 cited from Tadhkirah p.591

ⁱⁱⁱ Sīrat-ul-Mahdī vol.3 p.119 narration 672

Similarly, it is written in *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī*ⁱ that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī died from cholera in a lavatory in Lahore. Therefore, his prophecy that he would die in Makkah or Madīnah was completely false. There is no room for any doubt in it.

FOURTH FALSE PROPHECY

Pīr Mandhūr was a special disciple of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī came to know that his wife is pregnant. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made a prophecy that she would give birth to a boy. The words of the prophecy are,

‘The first revelation was that the earthquake that would be an illustration of *Qiyāmah* would occur shortly. The sign for it would be that the wife of Pīr Mandhūr Muhammad Ludhiyānwī, Muhammadī Begum, would give birth to a boy. The boy would be a sign for the earthquake. Therefore, his name would be Bashīr-ud-Dawlah.’ⁱⁱ

However, a girl was born. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī said that the intended meaning was not that a boy would be born from this pregnancy. A boy could be born in future. However, coincidentally the woman

ⁱ *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī* vol.1 p.11

ⁱⁱ Haqīqat-ul-Wahī on the footnotes of Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.22 p.103

passed away. This prophecy also proved to be false. Neither did the woman give birth to a boy, nor was there any earthquake. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was disgraced.

FIFTH FALSE PROPHECY

Muhammadī Begum was the young daughter of the cousin of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, Mirzā Ahmad Baig. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī intended to forcefully marry her. Coincidentally, Mirzā Ahmad Baig needed the signature of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī with regards to the documents for a certain land. Accordingly, he came to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and requested him to sign on the document. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī found this occasion to be a blessing for his objective. He said to Ahmad Baig, 'I will make *Istikhārah* and then sign.' After a few days, when Ahmad Baig requested him to sign, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī said, 'I will only sign if you marry your daughter, Muhammadī Begum, to me. Goodness is only in it.' His threatening words are,

'Allāh ﷻ has sent revelation to me that send a proposal of marriage to the elder daughter of this person, i.e. Ahmad Baig. Say to him, he should first accept you as a son-in-law and he should derive light from your spiritual light. Say to him, I have received a command to gift the land you desire. In fact, extra land would be

given with it and other favours would be bestowed on you, on condition that you marry your daughter to me. This is the pact between me and you. If you would accept, then I would accept. If you would reject, then be aware that Allāh has informed me that if this girl would be married to any other person, then the marriage would not be a blessing for the girl and neither for you.ⁱ

The ill effect of the threats was that Mīrzā Ahmad Baig and his family members clearly refused to marry Muhammadi Begum to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī wrote letters, took out notices and issued prophecies to the extent that he exerted all his efforts in pleading and begging (with them) to fulfil his wish. However, Muhammadi Begum married another person, Mirzā Sultān, and she did not come into his *Nikāh* until his final breath. The words of the false prophecies of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī in this regard are,

‘Allāh ﷻ made manifest this prophecy as a sign for the opposing relatives of this weak one that from amongst them, the person who is Ahmad Baig, if he would not give his eldest daughter to this weak one, then he would die in three (3) years, in fact, even before that. The person who will marry (this girl) will die within

ⁱ Ā’inah Kamālat-Islām vol.5 pp.572-573

two and a half years of marriage. Finally, this woman will be one of the wives of this weak one.ⁱ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī further explained this prophecy,

‘It is not one (1) claim in this prophecy, in fact it is six (6) claims. Firstly, I would remain alive until the marriage. Secondly, it is certain that the girl’s father would remain alive until the marriage. Thirdly, the girl’s father would die within a short period after the marriage, which would be less than three (3) years. Fourthly, her husband would die within two and a half years. Fifthly, the girl would remain alive until the time that I marry her. Sixthly, after breaking all the customs of being a widow, she would marry me despite severe opposition from her relatives.’ⁱⁱ

This prophecy has also been stated in *Anjām Ātham*ⁱⁱⁱ and in different places in *Tadhkirah* in different words^{iv}. It is the power of Allah ﷻ that this prophecy of Mirzā

ⁱ Ishtihār 20 February 1886 C.E, Tablīgh-Risālat vol.1 p. 61

ⁱⁱ Ā’inah Kamālāt-Islām on Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.5 p.325

ⁱⁱⁱ Anjām Ātham p.131

^{iv} The Arabic inspiration (Ilhām) in this regard is,

كذبوا بآياتنا و كانوا بها يستهزؤون فسيكفيهم الله و يردها إليك لا تبديل لكلمت الله إن ربك فعال لما يريد أنت معي وأنا معك عسى أن يبعثك مقاما محمودا

(Ā’inah Kamālāt-Islām, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.5 pp. 286- 287)

Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī turned out to be false in every regard. Every claim turned out to be false. Muhammadī Begum's husband remained alive for forty (40) years after the death of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. He passed away in 1948 C.E. Muhammadī Begum remained alive until 1966 C.E and she continued to announce the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. She passed away on 19 November 1966 C.E in Lahore in the state of Islām. To sum it all, Allāh ﷻ disgraced Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī through this prophecy.

Today, any person of intelligence can attain conviction on the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī by taking a look at the incident of Muhammadī Begum.

SIXTH FALSE PROPHECY

The first prophecy Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made about his age was,

‘Allāh ﷻ intended that the people of this era should not only benefit from my prophecy, but some prophecies should be such that they serve as a great sign for the people to come afterwards, just as the prophecies in *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* and other books, that I would give you a life of eighty years (80) or a few extra years or a little less and I would free you from all the accusations

of the opponents.ⁱ

The readers can see for themselves how unclear this prophecy is. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī wants his statement to become true under any circumstance. Therefore, upon the objection of the people, he further vaguely clarified (this prophecy) in the addendum of *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* in volume five,

‘Allāh ﷻ informed me in clear words that your age will be eighty years (80) or five (5) to six (6) years extra or five (5) to six (6) years less. In fact, in this regard, the sentence that is mentioned in the revelation, hope has been given in a hidden way, that if Allāh ﷻ wants, then (your) age can be a little over eighty (80). As for the apparent words of the revelation, they stipulate an age between seventy-four (74) and eighty-six (86). Nevertheless, there has been a false allegation against me that I have made no specification about the period of this prophecy.’ⁱⁱ

The matter remains the same. However, Allāh ﷻ severely disgraced this great liar through this prophecy. He did not live for eighty (80) years or seventy-four (74) years. According to his very own writings, his age was sixty-eight (68) or sixty-nine (69). He writes,

‘Now, my personal details are that I was born in 1839

ⁱ Tiryāq-ul-Qulūb footnotes p. 13, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.15 p.152

ⁱⁱ Addendum to Barāhīn-Ahmadiyyah vol.5 p.97, 98

C.E or 1840 C.E, in the final era of the Sikhs. In 1857 C.E, I was sixteen (16) or seventeen (17) years old.”ⁱ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī died in 1908 C.E from cholera. Accordingly, his age was sixty-nine (69) at most.

PERPLEXITY OF THE MIRZĀ’IS

The untimely death of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and the clear falsehood of the prophecy lead to confusion amongst all the Mirzā’is. The people of authority began to make excuses to appease the masses and they tried to prove the prophecy to be true. Firstly, Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd wrote that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was born in 1837 C.E. Then, Bashīr Ahmed (M.A) said something surprising, that he was born in 1836 C.E. Then, another research was done that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was born on 12 February 1835 C.E. However, these three endeavours could not solve the problem, because it does not reach seventy-four (74) years. Therefore, Doctor Bashārat Ahmad wrote in *Mujaddid-A’dham*ⁱⁱ that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was born in 1833 C.E. One Mirzā’ī Maulwī exceeded all limits when he made the claim

ⁱ Footnotes to Kitāb-ul-Bariyyah p.159, footnotes to Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.13 p.177

ⁱⁱ Mujaddid-A’dham vol.1 p.17

that, ‘all (the dates) are incorrect. (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself made a mistake when he mentioned his date of birth and he spoke a lie.) Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was born in 1830 C.E.’

Every person of intelligence can understand that after the clarity provided by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself about his date of birth (that he was born in 1839 C.E, 1840 C.E), for the Mirzā’is to differ and present new research, this is a clear proof of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī being a great liar. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is a liar in every respect. If his mentioned date of birth is correct, then the prophecy is false and if the prophecy is believed to be true, then his mentioned date of birth is a clear lie.

SEVENTH FALSE PROPHECY

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes,

‘According to an estimation, eighteen (18) years have passed when due to a certain occasion, I went to the house of Maulwī Muhammad Husayn Batālwī, the editor of the magazine, *‘Ishā’at-us-Sunnah*. He asked me, “Has any inspiration come to you these days?” I mentioned to him the inspiration I have mentioned to my sincere followers a few time, بكر و ثيب (a virgin and a non-virgin), the meaning of which is that Allāh ﷻ will bring two women into my *Nikāh*. One will be a virgin

and the other will be a widow. Accordingly, the inspiration regarding the virgin has been fulfilled. *Alhamdulillāh*, I have four (4) sons from this wife. I am (now) waiting for the inspiration of the widow.”ⁱ

CRITIQUE

According to the words of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, he received this inspiration in 1881 C.E, as written in the footnotes of *Tadhkirah*. To fulfil this inspiration, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī married Nusrat Jahā Begum in 1884 C.E, who was a virgin. Now, according to the heavenly promise, it was also necessary for him to marry a widow. Accordingly, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī would make the prophecy that the husband of Muhammadī Begum, Sultān Baig, would pass away and Muhammadī Begum would marry him. It did not fall in his lot to marry Muhammadī Begum in the state of being a widow and he left the world with this grief. The prophecy of the widow turned out to be a clear lie. It became a means for his disgrace, because no widow came into the *Nikāh* of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī did not have conviction that Muhammadī Begum was the substantiation of

ⁱ Tiryāq-ul-Qulūb p.34, addendum to Anjām Ātham p.14, Tadhkirah p.39

‘widow’,

‘Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had fabricated this revelation in the name of Allāh, that Ahmad Baig should first accept you as a son-in-law (and not Sultān Muhammad).’ⁱ

For Muhammadī Begum to come into the *Nikāh* of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī after becoming a widow was something of the second stage. However, when her *Nikāh* was made to Sultān Muhammad, then Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made Muhammadī Begum the substantiation of ‘widow’. If his first thoughts were to be correct and had Muhammadī Begum come first into his *Nikāh*, then too this inspiration of his would be false, because a virgin came (into his marriage) and the inspiration of a non-virgin remained unfulfilled.

This inspiration of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was very clear without any condition attached to it. Therefore, there is no room for any interpretation here. However, the compiler of *Tadhbkirah* fabricated a strange interpretation through the aid of his *Shaytān*. He stated a meaning that did not even strike Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. He wrote in the footnotes,

‘This inspiration manifested itself in the being of *Umm-ul-Mu’minīn* (referring to Nusrat Jahā Begum) through

ⁱ Check Ruhānī Khazā’ in vol.5 p.572

both angles, i.e. she came as a virgin and she was left as a non-virgin.ⁱ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī did not say that he would marry one woman who would be a virgin and she would be left a non-virgin after him. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī wrote in clear words that he would marry two women. Look at the condition of the person who wrote the footnote and the (other) Mirzā's in interpreting this inspiration, that instead of having fear of Allāh ﷻ, adopting modesty from the people and believing Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī to be a liar, they have defended Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and have made an attempt to deceive the people through senseless talk.

﴿خَتَمَ اللَّهُ عَلَى قُلُوبِهِمْ وَعَلَى سَمْعِهِمْ وَعَلَى أَبْصَارِهِمْ غِشَاوَةٌ وَلَهُمْ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ﴾

البقرة: ٧

EIGHTH FALSE PROPHECY

Whilst mentioning the signs of Sayyidunā Mahdī ﷺ and the promised Messiah, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī mentioned that the train would be setup in Makkah Mukarramah and Madīnah Munawwarah within three (3) years. The text is,

‘This prophecy would be fulfilled specifically by the

ⁱ Khāksār Murattib Tadhkirah p.39

train system being set up in Makkah Mukarramah and Madīnah Munawwarah, because the train that would depart from Damascus and come to Madīnah Munawwarah, the same train would come to Makkah Mukarramah. There is hope that this task would be completed swiftly within a few years. At that time, the camels that would take the pilgrims from Makkah to Madīnah would be rendered useless all at once and a great revolution would occur in the travels between the Arab lands and Syria. Accordingly, this work is being carried out very swiftly and there is no astonishment that the path between Makkah and Madīnah would be completed within three (3) years. Instead of being pelted with stones by the Bedouins, the pilgrims will now enjoy various fruits on the way to Madīnah.”ⁱ

The Qādiyānīs should now say whether the train route between Makkah Mukarramah and Madīnah Munawwarah has commenced? If not, and certainly not, then was this prophecy a cause for the disgrace of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī or not?

It should be remembered that this book was authored in 1902 C.E. According to the prophecy of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, this train should be running in 1905 C.E. Ninety-five years have passed and the train

ⁱ Tuhfah Golrawiyyah p.103

system has still not been set up. In fact, the train that was to travel between Madīnah Munawwarah and Syria also stopped due to the misfortune of this false Messiah.

NINTH FALSE PROPHECY

GLAD TIDINGS OF GHULĀM HALĪM

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī stated that his fourth son, Mubārak Ahmad, was a substantiation of the inspirations of the promised reformer, one who would receive a long life, as though Allāh ﷻ descended from the heavens etc. This son passed away before attaining puberty. After his death, objections surrounded Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī from all sides. He once again began to fabricate inspirations to cool down his disciples.

On 16 September 1907 C.E he mentioned an inspiration,

إنا نبشرك بغلام حلیم

Certainly we give you the glad tidings of a forbearing son.ⁱ

He mentioned another inspiration after one month,

“Your son was born, i.e. he would be born in the future.

ⁱ Al-Bushrā vol.2 p.134

إنا نبشرك بغلام حلیم

Certainly we give you the glad tidings of a forbearing son

ينزل منزل المبارك

*He will resemble Mubārak Ahmad.*ⁱ

He mentioned another inspiration after a few days,

سأهب لك غلاما زكيا رب هب لي ذرية طيبة إنا نبشرك بغلام اسمه يحيى

*I give you the glad tidings of a pure son. O my lord, grant me pure offspring. I give you the glad tidings of a son, whose name will be Yahyā.*ⁱⁱ

In these inspirations, a prophecy was made of a pure son, Yahyā. He was to be a substitute of Mubārak Ahmad. After this, no son was born in the house of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Therefore, all these inspirations proved to be lies attributed towards Allāh



TENTH FALSE PROPHECY: QĀDIYĀN WILL REMAIN PROTECTED FROM THE PLAGUE

A plague hit India during the time of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made the prophecy, ‘I received inspiration that Qadiyan would

ⁱ Al-Bushrā vol.2 p.136

ⁱⁱ Al-Bushrā vol.2 p.136

be protected from the plague.’

His words are,

1. ما كان الله ليعذبهم وأنت فيهم إنه أوى القرية لولاك الأكرام هلك المقام

*Allāh ﷺ will not punish the people of Qadiyan whilst you are amongst them. He will protect this village from the negative effects of the plague. Had you not been honourable in my sight, I would have destroyed this village.*ⁱ

2. ‘The powerful lord will protect Qadiyan from the negative effects of the plague until you would understand that Qadiyan was protected because the Rasūl of Allāh was in it.’ⁱⁱ

3. The third point that is established from this revelation is that for as long as the plague remains, even though it may be seventy (70) years, Allāh ﷺ will protect Qadiyan from the negative effects of it because it (Qadiyan) is the royal residence of His Rasūl and it is a sign for all the *Ummahs*.ⁱⁱⁱ

This prophecy also proved to be false and a cause for the

ⁱ Tadhkirah p.436

ⁱⁱ Dāfi’ul-Balā’ pp.4-5, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.18. pp.225-226

ⁱⁱⁱ Dāfi’ul-Balā’ p.10 , Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.18 p.230

disgrace of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Qadiyan, in the words of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī ‘the place of the Rasūl’, was not protected from the plague.

CONFESSION THAT THE PROPHECIES WERE WRONG & FALSE: FROM THE PEN OF MIRZĀ GHULĀM AHMAD QĀDIYĀNĪ

1. ‘The effect of the plague is very heavy here. Eight persons passed away yesterday. We ask Allāh ﷻ for His favour.’ⁱ
2. ‘There is no noticeable shortage in Qadiyan until now. As I am writing now, a Hindu neighbour of ours by the name of Bījñāth passed away after remaining ill for a few hours.’ⁱⁱ
3. ‘Dear Ukhūyam Seth Sāhib!

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

The effect of the plague is heavy here. A few suspicious occurrences have taken place in Amritsar. A few days have passed; a growth also

ⁱ Letter of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, 16 April 1904 C.E

ⁱⁱ Maktūbāt-Ahmadiyyah vol.5 no.4 p.116

- appeared on my body.’ⁱ
4. ‘O Allāh, lift the plague from our people.’ⁱⁱ
 5. ‘The plague hit Qadiyan. Sometimes there were even severe attacks. However, according to His promise, Allāh ﷻ protected (us) from the destruction that we saw in the other villages. Then, Allāh ﷻ also showed the negative effects of the plague around the house of the promised Messiah and a number of deaths occurred in the neighbouring households.’ⁱⁱⁱ
 6. ‘Once there was a severe plague that hit Qadiyan.’^{iv}
 7. Announcement: As the plague is at its peak in every place these days, therefore, although relatively there is tranquillity in Qadiyan, however, we find it appropriate (to state) in accordance with preventative measures that large gatherings should be avoided. The people should make *du’ā* from their respective places that Allāh

ⁱ Maktūbāt Ahmadiyyah vol.5 no.1 Maktūbāt no.38

ⁱⁱ Akhbār Badr Qādiyān 4 May 1905, cited from Muhammadi Pocket Book p.325

ⁱⁱⁱ Silsilah Ahmadiyyah vol.1 p.122

^{iv} Haqīqat-ul-Wahī p.232, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.22 p. 244

ﷺ should protect them and their families from this calamity.ⁱ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was disgraced through this prophecy just as he was disgraced through the countless other prophecies.

Note: We have presented these few prophecies as an illustration, all of which proved to be false. However, according to the criterion set out by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, he being found false in a single prophecy would be sufficient to disgrace him and prove him to be a liar.

FOURTH ANGLE OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ: POETRY

Every Muslim is aware that a Nabī cannot be a poet. In the Noble Qur’ān, Allāh ﷻ mentioned in response to the disbelievers of Makkah,

﴿وَمَا عَلَّمْنَاهُ الشِّعْرَ وَمَا يَنْبَغِي لَهُ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا ذِكْرٌ وَقُرْآنٌ مُبِينٌ﴾ يس: ٦٩

We did not teach him (Rasūlullāh ﷺ) poetry, nor does it behove him

Similarly, Allāh ﷻ mentions regarding the Noble

ⁱ Akhbār-ul-Badr Qādiyān 19 December 1903 C.E

Qur'ān,

﴿وَمَا هُوَ بِقَوْلِ شَاعِرٍ﴾ الحاقة: ٤١

It is not the word of a poet

To sum it all, it is certain that a Nabī cannot be a poet. The person who is a poet cannot be a Nabī. According to this principle, it should be that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was not a poet and that no poetry came out from his mouth. However, upon pondering, we come to know that not only was Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī a poet, in fact he was a claimant to miraculous poetry. He wrote *Qasīdah I'jāziyah* to prove his truthfulness. Much of his poetry has been published in the collection, *Dur-Thamīn*. It is the power of Allāh ﷻ that this very same poetry of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī turned out to be a clear sign of his falsehood. Perhaps Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī did not know this reality, otherwise he would have left out saying poetry in attestation to his self-proclaimed *Nubuwwat* and he would have also instructed for his previous poetry to be destroyed.

CONSTERNATION OF THE MIRZĀ'IS

When this proof of the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is presented in front of the Mirzā'is, then without any sense of honour the Mirzā'is give a reply that what is the big fuss if Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad

Qādiyānī said poetry? Rasūlullāh ﷺ would also say poetry, just as he ﷺ once said when his finger became injured,

هل أنت إلا إصبع دميت وفي سبيل الله ما لقيت

*You are naught but a finger and what you have acquired
was in the path of Allāh*

In the same manner, (Rasūlullāh ﷺ recited),

اللهم لا عيش إلا عيش الآخرة فاغفر الأنصار والمهاجرة

O Allāh, there is no life but the life of the hereafter, so
forgive the *Ansār* and the *Muhājirīn*

In this regard it should be remembered that these statements of Rasūlullāh ﷺ do not fall under the category of poetry. Coincidentally they have become metrical without any intention. This is because the definition of poetry is, هو كلام موزون يقصد به, i.e. in poetry an intention (of poetry) is a condition. This is contrary to the poetry of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī because his poetry was said with an intention (of poetry). Without any doubt, these poems are a clear sign that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was a *Dajjāl* and a liar. How can one thing that is a defect for the original be an excellent trait and proof of *Nubuwwat* for the follower, (the) *Zill*? How astonishing!

Did Rasūlullāh ﷺ also present poetry to prove his

truthfulness?

FIFTH ANGLE OF THE FALSEHOOD OF MIRZĀ: THE REVELATION & INSPIRATIONS OF MIRZĀ IN DIFFERENT LANGUAGES

It has been the way of Allāh ﷻ that revelation was sent to every Nabī in the language of the people to whom he was sent. This method was adopted from Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ right until the last of all the messengers, Sayyidunā Muhammad ﷺ. It has never occurred that a Rasūl would be sent to a Hebrew nation and revelation would come to him in the Syriac language. It is for this reason that it is mentioned in the Noble Qur'ān,

﴿وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا بِلِسَانِ قَوْمِهِ لِيُبَيِّنَ لَهُمْ﴾ إبراهيم: ٤

And We have not sent any Rasūl except that he spoke the language of his nationⁱ

If Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was the Nabī of Allāh ﷻ, then revelation would come to him only in the Punjabi and Urdu language. However, in the Qur'ān of the Mirzā'is, *Tadhkirah*, the revelations of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī have been recorded in ten (10) languages. These multiple (languages) are a clear sign to the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Then the icing on the cake is that *Shaytānī*

ⁱ Sūrah Ibrāhīm: 3

revelation also came to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī in certain languages which he himself did not know. He would understand the meaning of the revelation from others. This is also a solid proof of his falsehood.

A POINTLESS ENDEAVOUR

The Mirzā's present two points to repel this objection, the status of which is nothing more than a pointless endeavour.

First Point:

Revelation to descend on Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī in different languages is a proof of his perfection. This is because the more the languages of revelation, it would be a proof for the perfection of the Nabī and to the vastness of the *Ummah* of the Nabī.

Answer:

The basis of this point is incorrect, that receiving revelation in different languages is a sign of perfection, as was stated earlier from the Noble Qur'ān. Granted that it is a (sign of) perfection, then it would be considered a perfection when the Nabī himself understands every revelation. This was not found in Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī because he did not understand many of his revelations due them being in other languages.

Second Point:

As Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was an international Nabī, revelation came to him in different languages. Therefore, this is not considered a weakness.

Answer 1:

Our question to the Mirzā'īs is that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was also a global Nabī, why did revelation not come to him in different languages? It is strange that the emerged (*Burūzī*) Nabī surpasses the original Nabī!

Answer 2:

If Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was a global Nabī, then revelation should have come to him in all the languages of the world, which are approximately four thousand five hundred (4500) in number. What is the significance of these ten (10) languages that had the honour of being the revelation of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī? Another strange point is that many of the revelations of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had linguistic errors in them. If these revelations were from Allāh ﷻ, then there should have been no errors in them.

To sum it all, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was a liar in every aspect. The Mirzā'īs can make all the effort but they will never succeed until *Qiyāmāh* in proving their false Nabī to be true. *Inshā Allāh!*

**SIXTH ANGLE OF THE FALSEHOOD OF
MIRZĀ: FINAL DECISION WITH MAULĀNĀ
THANĀ-ULLĀH AMRITSARĪ**

Maulānā Thanā-ullāh Amritsarī was a senior Ahl-ul-Hadīth scholar and a student of Shaykhul-Hind Maulānā Mahmūdul-Hasan Deobandī رحمہ اللہ in Hadīth. He did magnificent work in refuting *Qādiyānism*. He would occasionally refute the writings and baseless inspirations of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. He had kept Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī's mouth closed. When all limits were crossed and Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī's confusion knew no bounds, in desperation he made an announcement as a final decision. The words were,

‘In the presence of Maulānā Thanā-ullah,

السلام علی من اتبع الهدی

From a long period, you have been falsifying me in your Ahl-ul-Hadīth periodical. In this periodical of yours, you have always attributed the words ‘condemned’, ‘a great liar’, ‘*Dajjāl*’ and ‘mischief maker’ towards me. I endured great pain from you and remained patient. If I am a great liar as you often say, then I would be destroyed during your lifetime. If I am not a great liar, and I am honoured with being in conversation with Allāh ﷻ and I am the promised Messiah, then I have hope in the grace of Allāh ﷻ that according to the

system of Allāh ﷻ you would not be spared from the punishment of those who falsify. If the punishments that are not in the control of humans and are only in the control of Allāh ﷻ, for example, plague, cholera and similar life-threatening illnesses, do not afflict you during my lifetime, then I am not sent from Allāh ﷻ. This is not a prophecy based on an inspiration or revelation. In fact, I have asked for this decision from Allāh ﷻ through *du'ā*. Finally, I would request Maulānā to publish this article of mine in his periodical. You can write whatever you wish beneath it. The decision is now in the hands of Allāh ﷻ.ⁱ

Written by:

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, 15 April 1907 C.E.

DIVINE DECREE

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī died on 26 May 1908 C.E in Lahore, exactly one year one month and eleven days after the above announcement and *du'ā* was published. Maulānā Thanā-ullah remained alive for forty (40) years after the death of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and he continued to proclaim the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. In this way, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī proved to be a great liar

ⁱ Majmū'ah Ishtihārāt vol.3 p.579

through his own admission.

INTERPRETATION OF THE MIRZĀ'IS

Whilst defending Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, the Mirzā'is try to provide comfort to their hearts by saying that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī invited Maulānā Thanā-ullāh to a *Mubāhalah* through this writing of his. Maulānā Thanā-ullāh was not ready for the *Mubāhalah*. Therefore, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī's death during his lifetime is not a proof of falsehood.

FEEBLENESS OF THE INTERPRETATION

We should remember two answers to prove the feebleness of this disjointed and false interpretation.

1. *Mubāhalah* is not mentioned at all in this writing of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. In fact, it is only a one sided *du'ā*. How can one prove from it that Maulānā Thanā-ullāh did not accept the *Mubāhalah*? Then, the reality is that Maulānā Thanā-ullāh repeatedly invited this cursed one for a *Mubāhalah*. However, he would always avoid confronting Maulānā Thanā-ullāh. It is for this reason that Maulānā Zafar 'Alī Khān said,

They flee from the name of Mubāhalah

Just as Kufr flees from the Bayt-ul-Harām

2. Even after the death of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, Maulānā Thanā-ullah Sāhib ﷺ remained firm on his stance against Qādiyānism. Accordingly, in 1912 C.E he had a debate with Mīr Qāsim ‘Ālī Qādiyānī through writing. A Sikh leader, Bachn Singh was made the arbitrator. Each party put down three hundred (300) rupees. The arbitrator ruled in favour of Maulānā Thanā-ullāh Sāhib and he won the prize.ⁱ Therefore, it would be completely incorrect to say that Maulānā Thanā-ullāh Sāhib backed out. Nevertheless, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī’s death during the lifetime of Maulānā Thanā-ullāh Sāhib is a living proof of his falsehood.

DEATH OF MIRZĀ FROM CHOLERA

When the reality is presented in front of the Mirzā’s that their false Nabī died from cholera, they try to falsify this reality with full might. Therefore, as proof to the claim, a Muslim debater should remember the following two citations,

ⁱ The arbitrator handed over the six hundred (600) rupees to Maulānā Thanā-ullāh Sāhib. With this money, Maulānā published the written debate under the name ‘*Fātih-Qādiyān*’, which is also available today.

1. Citation One:

It is written in *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī*,

‘Our mother mentioned that the promised Messiah experienced the first diarrhoeal discharge at the time of meals. Thereafter we rubbed his legs for a short while, and he comfortably laid down and fell asleep. I also fell asleep. However, after some time he felt the urge (to relieve himself). He then went once or twice to the lavatory to relieve himself. He then became weaker. He woke me up using his hands. When I woke up, he was feeling so weak that he laid down on my bedstead. I sat down to rub his legs. After a little while he said, you should sleep now. I said, “No, I will rub (your legs).” During this time, he had another diarrhoeal discharge. However, he was now so weak that he could not go to the lavatory. Therefore, I made arrangements next to the bedstead. He sat there and relieved himself. He then stood up and laid down on the bedstead. I continued to rub his legs. However, he had now become very weak. He then had another diarrhoeal discharge. He then vomited. When he completed vomiting and went to lie down, he had become so weak that he fell with his back on the bedstead. His head hit the timber of the bedstead and his condition

deteriorated.’ⁱ

It is clearly apparent from this citation that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī died from cholera, because according to medical practitioners cholera is a combination of vomiting and diarrhoeal discharges.

ADMIRABLE MAGIC

2. Citation Two:

During his final illness, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī once called his father-in-law and said, ‘Mīr Sāhib, the cholera outbreak has affected me.’ⁱⁱ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had studied a few books on medicine. Therefore, his diagnosis of the illness would be accepted to be correct. After his clear admission, there remains no room for any interpretation regarding his death occurring from cholera.

FEEBLE EXCUSE

Despite the many solid proofs and glaring facts, the

ⁱ Sīrat-ul-Mahdī vol.1 p.11 Hadīth 12

ⁱⁱ Hayāt-Nāsir p.14

Mirzā'īs take support from the following weak interpretations to save themselves from embarrassment.

‘It is prohibited to transport the body of a person who dies from an epidemic by train, whilst the body of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was transported from Lahore to Qadiyan by train. We come to know from here that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī did not die from an epidemic.’ⁱ

SUBHĀNALLĀH

The Mirzā'īs should be praised on their blind love for giving this splendid interpretation. Every person of understanding knows that many things in the world occur that are contrary to the law. These laws hold no importance in a place where there is abundance of intercession, wheedling, flattery and wealth. It is possible that one of the disciples of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī spoke a lie or paid a bribe and obtained permission from the train officials to transport the body. In fact, there would have been no need to obtain permission because the British were ruling at that time, and in his own words Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was ‘a sapling of the British’. If the British government would not allow for the body of its own

ⁱ Check Mujaddid A'dham vol.2 p.1211

cultivated sapling to be transported by train then who else would it allow? The law of prohibition was not for the self-cultivated saplings like Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Therefore, it is absolute foolishness to deduce from the transportation of the body that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī did not die from cholera.

DIVINE MERCY

Take a look at how Mīr Nāsir Nawāb himself describes the British government as divine mercy and the solution to this difficulty,

‘On the one side, the difficulty of your demise came upon us. On the other side, the mischievous people of Lahore made a lot of noise. They surrounded our house when, through divine mercy, the police arrived for our protection. They protected us from the oppression of the people and they escorted us to the railway station in full security. We are grateful to the British government who provided us safety and protected us from our mean enemies.’ⁱ

SINGLE TRUTH OF HIS LIFE

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī spoke falsehood throughout his life. However, he proved one statement

ⁱ Hayāt Nāsir pp.14-15

to be true. He once said, “The train is the donkey of *Dajjāl*.” At that time, no one understood the nonsense Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was speaking. However, during the end of his life when he admitted in the announcement he made against Maulānā Thanā-ullāh that he was a *Dajjāl* and after his death when his body was transported to Qadiyan by train, then the people understood why Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī referred to the train as the donkey of *Dajjāl*.

MIRZĀ SEEKS MUBĀHALAH

In order to trap the simple Muslims, the Mirzā’is played the deceit of *Mubāhalah* for a long time. However, the reality is that the announcements of *Mubāhalah* became an everlasting sign of the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. This could be understood from the details mentioned below.

MUBĀHALA BETWEEN MAULĀNĀ ‘ABDUL-HAQ GHAZNAWĪ & MIRZĀ GHULĀM AHMAD QĀDIYĀNĪ

A face-to-face *Mubāhalah* took place between Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and a well-known scholar of *Dīn*, Maulānā ‘Abdul-Haq Ghaznawī on 10 Dhul-Qa’dah 1310 A.H, 16 May 1893 C.E in the ‘*Īd* Salāh area of Amritsar. Maulānā made the *Mubāhalah* on the point that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and his

followers are *Dajjāl*, non-believers (*kāfir*), infidels and irreligious. It should be clear that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī stated the following principle seven months twenty-four days before his death, on 17 October 1907 C.E.,

‘From amongst those who made *Mubāhalah*, the one who is a liar will be destroyed within the lifetime of the one who is true.’ⁱ

It was the decree of Allāh ﷻ that according to this principle, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī died during the lifetime of Maulānā Ghaznawī, on Tuesday, 26 May 1908 C.E. Thereafter, Maulānā Ghaznawī remained alive for nine (9) years. He passed away on 16 May 1917 C.E.

Accordingly, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī proved to be a liar according to his own *Mubāhalah* and stated principle. There now remains no need for any further testimony.

FINAL DECISION WITH MAULĀNĀ THANĀ- ULLĀH AMRITSARĪ

The details have passed in the previous pages that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made *du’ā* with utmost humility that from amongst us, the one who is a liar, he

ⁱ Malfūdhāt vol.9 p.440

should die during the lifetime of the one who is true. Accordingly, this heartfelt desire of his was fulfilled and he was destroyed during the lifetime of Maulānā Amritsarī through his own *du'ā*. In this way, Allāh ﷻ exposed his falsehood. Maulānā Amritsarī remained alive for forty-one (41) years after the death of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and he continued the great service of uprooting *Mirzā'iyyat*.

INVITATION TO MUBĀHALAH OF MIRZA & HIS REPENTANCE

In his book *Anjām Ātham*, which was published in 1897 C.E, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī invited over two hundred (200) scholars from the state for *Mubāhalah*. The name of Maulānā Muhammad Husayn Batālwī was third on the list. In response to this, Maulānā Muhammad Husayn Batālwī filed a case against Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī in the Godraspur district court, that he was causing difficulty for him through the challenge of *Mubāhalah*. The case continued. Finally, to attain relief, on 24 February 1899 C.E Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had to write a long letter of repentance in the court of the deputy commissioner, J.M Dooi. Take a look at the fifth clause of the letter and express delight at the disgrace of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

LETTER OF REPENTANCE

‘I will also refrain from inviting Maulānā Abū Sa’īd Muhammad Husayn or any of his friends or elders to a challenge in this matter that they request a *Mubāhalah* from Allāh ﷻ so that He makes apparent who was true and who was false in so and so discussion.’

Also take a look at the sixth clause,

‘To the best of my ability I will encourage all those persons upon whom I have authority that they should from their own sides adopt the manner to which I have attested to and abide to in clause 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.’

After this letter, there should be no doubt on the falsehood of Mirza Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, because no person other than a liar would repent from a *Mubāhalah* after inviting towards it. All the Mirzā’s should have regard for the repentance of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and they should stop this deception of *Mubāhalah* right until *Qiyāmah*, otherwise it would mean that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is a *Dajjāl* and liar or that there is no regard for his repentance. However, there is sorrow at the fact that the Mirzā’s have not stopped this most loved deception of theirs. In fact, the successors of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī continued to act contrary to this resolution of his after his death. They continue in their evil way of terming *du’ā* as *Mubāhalah*. These days Mirzā Tāhir is doing the

same thing, whilst in reality *Mubāhalah* is when two groups gather at one place and make *du'ā*.ⁱ

One should remember these six points on the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Just as there are six points of *Tablīgh*, there are six points in refutation of *Qādiyānism*.

MIRZĀ TĀHIR CALLS FOR MUBĀHALAH & RESPONSE OF MAULĀNĀ MANZŪR AHMAD CHINIOTĪ

Accordingly, a few years ago the current leader of the Qādiyānis, Mirzā Tāhir also invited the scholars of the entire world for *Mubāhalah*. *Alhamdulillah* the protectors of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* provided intellectual and practical answers. In this regard, the one penning these lines, Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī sent a letter to Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad. The letter was sent through registered post on 25 August 1988 C.E. A respite period of forty (40) days was granted for a response. However, no response came from the Mirzā'is, as is their habit. The letter is presented below. It contains valuable findings.

‘Janāb Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad Sāhib, the head of Jāmā’at

ⁱ Check the text of Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.11 p.40, Anjām Ātham (footnote) p.3

Mirzā'iyah

السلام على من اتبع الهدى

You are the junior successor of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. When your grandfather, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī found all his claims to be false, he used the ploy of *Mubāhalah* after suffering defeat in (presenting) proofs. In his book *Anjām Ātham*, he invited over two hundred (200) scholars for *Mubāhalah*. Maulānā Muhammad Husayn Batālwī's name was third on the list. Accordingly, two (2) years after the publication of the book, upon the request of Maulānā Muhammad Husayn Batālwī, on 24 February 1899 C.E Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had to write a long letter of repentance in front of J.M Dooi, the deputy commissioner of Godraspur. The fifth point in the document was,

REPENTANCE OF MIRZĀ GHULĀM AHMAD

'To the best of my ability I will encourage all those persons upon whom I have authority that they should from their own sides adopt the manner to which I have attested to and abide to in clause 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.'

According to this document, every individual from the Mirzā's who believes in Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is restrained from inviting any person for *Mubāhalah*.

In order to cover up this disgrace, when the Qādiyānīs restarted this propaganda of *Mubāhalah* and they began their endeavour to mislead the simple minded people by showing them the book *Anjām Ātham* of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, then to establish the proof, ‘I invited your father Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd Ahmad on 6 January 1956 C.E for *Mubāhalah*. Correspondence (between us) continued for approximately seven (7) years in order to set out the conditions and other matters. Finally, upon the completion of all the conditions, 26 February 1963 C.E the day of *Īd-ul-Fitr* was decided (for the *Mubāhalah*). The place Chaki, which is located between the two ends of the Chenab River, was decided as the place of *Mubāhalah*. Accordingly, my associates and I came to the place of *Mubāhalah* on 26 February 1963 C.E. We waited until ‘*Asr Salāh*. However, your father did not come and I made *du’ā* (against him). In this manner, the final proof of Allāh ﷻ came to completion. In principle, the matter had terminated upon the establishment of the proof. However, after the death of your father, to further establish the proof, I also invited your elder brother Mirzā Nāsir Ahmad for *Mubāhalah*. However, he also did not accept. I also made the *du’ā* of *Mubāhalah* against him and he died on 9 June 1982 C.E.

You are now the head of the Qādiyānīs and the junior successor of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. You are

aware that the proof from the side of the Islāmic world has been established against you and the claim of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī that he has been commanded from the side of Allāh ﷻ is no longer a matter of dispute. The scholars from all the different groupings and all the Muslim governments have classified Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and his followers as disbelievers. After lengthy discussions were held in the national assembly of Pakistan and your elder brother Mirzā Nāsir Ahmad given a full opportunity to explain himself, the Mirzā'īs and Lāhorīs were classified as non-Muslim minorities.

The martial law government has also confirmed through its ordinance that you are not Muslim, whilst the reality is that this government was established against the first government. Had the decision of the first government been incorrect in any aspect, then the martial law government would have certainly changed it.

You and your entire following are not allowed in Saudi Arabia. King Fahd of Saudi Arabia refused the request of Hajj that you sent from Washington. He said that you would not be allowed to set foot in Saudi Arabia until you do not repent from your disbelief.

When the truth became clear, you should have stopped your stubbornness and should have forgone your worldly benefits. You should have concentrated on the

final result of your group and should have forsaken this false religion. You should have sincerely repented and saved yourself from the fire of *Jahannam*, just as Wārith Muhammad, the son of Elijah had done.

Now if you still regard your grandfather Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī to be true in his claims, if you believe that it is necessary to believe in him to attain salvation and if you believe that those who falsify him are people of *Jahannam* and the offspring of prostitutes, then come forward (because) Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī is still firm on his view. I am a representative of the four well-known *Dīnī* groupings of the state. The certificates of representation would be presented upon your request.

I take an emphasised oath in the punishment of Allāh ﷻ that I am certain that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is false in all his claims and according to the Hadīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, he is a liar, a *Dajjāl* and an apostate. Come forward for a *Mubāhalah* so that Allāh ﷻ would Himself make a decision between the one who is on truth and the one who is on falsehood. You can specify the place of *Mubāhalah* of your choice. I am ready to come there. We can decide on a date, otherwise 26 February is a date stipulated from before. It is the date that was stipulated for your father. Then, on this day I will ask for a final decision against you from Allāh ﷻ at the location which is between the two ends of the river Chenab.

WHAT IS MUBĀHALAH?

You have overlooked all the previous action (taken against you) and you have acted against the confession and advice of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī when you sent to me a new pamphlet (of *Mubāhalah*) from London. This is not an invitation to *Mubāhalah* and neither is it *Mubāhalah*. In a *Mubāhalah*, both parties come to one place and they come with their families. Both parties make the *du'ā* that the people on falsehood should go to *Jahannam* during the lifetime of the people who are on the truth. You did not come forward yourself, neither did you bring your family with. (Despite this) you are giving it the name of *Mubāhalah* and you are providing false comfort to your naive followers.

1. Why do you not accept the invitation of *Mubāhalah* that I sent to you in 1986 C.E?
2. Why have you avoided the *Mubāhalah* stated in the Noble Qur'ān, i.e to come out in the field, and why have you resorted to this *Mubāhalah* on paper?
3. Why did you not suffice on the claims of your grandfather that he was commanded from the side of Allāh ﷻ and why did you take support from subsidiary matters and texts?

4. When all the Muslims are united against you and they all regard you to be on falsehood and to be non-Muslim, then why did you send separate pamphlets to all of them? In this regard, was Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī not available from before as a representative?

CHALLENGE OF MIRZĀ TĀHIR IS ACCEPTED

Nevertheless this challenge of yours is accepted. You are also aware that it is ‘Manzūr’ that took you on in Rabwah and he has now come to London in your pursuit. I am certain that in the same manner as your grandfather, father and brother, you (also) will never come face-to-face for a *Mubāhalah* in an open field. In this regard, I would only say,

﴿فَاتَّقُوا النَّارَ الَّتِي وَقُودُهَا النَّاسُ وَالْحِجَارَةُ أُعِدَّتْ لِلْكَافِرِينَ﴾ البقرة: ٢٤

Then fear the fire whose fuel is men (like you) and stones, it has been prepared for the disbelievers

Note: I will wait for forty (40) days from the date of send-off days for your response. If you do not decide on the place of *Mubāhalah* and (do not) inform me, then it would be understood that you have accepted defeat. Then on the forty-first day I will go to Rabwah and make the announcement.’

A true well-wisher,
(Maulānā) Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī

Head of Idārah Markaziyyah Da'wat Wa Irshād,
Chiniot, Pakistan
Secretary of Ittilā'āt Jam'iyyat-ul-'Ulamā,
Pakistan

Note: This letter was sent through registered post to Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad at his address in London on 25 August 1988 C.E.

MIRZĀ TĀHIR ADMITS DEFEAT

The forty (40) day period ended on 17 October 1988 C.E. However, up to this day no reply was received from Mirzā Tāhir. Therefore, Mirzā Tāhir practiced on the way of his brother, father and grandfather, and he attested to his falsehood.

In order to cover up the defeat, Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad acted in a deceitful manner. He made a prophecy about Maulānā Chiniotī. His words are,

'I have conviction and all of you have conviction, no Ahmadī is excluded from this conviction that certainly this Maulwī will face disgrace. No power of the world can save him from the disgrace that Allāh ﷻ has decreed for the rebels who speak lies in *Mubāhalah*.'

Mirzā Tāhir stated that the final date for the prophecy would be 15 September 1989 C.E. However, this prophecy turned out to be expensive for Mirzā Tāhir

and he (himself) had to face a lot of disgrace.

1. They could not have their centenary celebrations on 23 March 1989 C.E.
2. They were expected to have their annual sitting in Rabwah in December 1989 C.E. (However), they could not have it.
3. In Rabwah, a number of Qādiyānīs became Bahā'īs.
4. Qādiyānism was wiped out from Kharian, Sargodha and many other places.
5. Many close associates of Mirzā Tāhir repented from Qādiyānism, amongst whom was Hasan Mahmūd 'Awdah, the chief editor of the monthly periodical of the Qādiyānīs, At-Taqwā. When the prophecy on the destruction of Maulānā Chiniotī proved to be false on 15 September 1989 C.E, he (Hasan Mahmūd 'Awdah) repented from Qādiyānism at the blessed hands (of Maulānā Chiniotī) in the Wembley Hall of London in front of a gathering of thousands of people on 1 October 1989 C.E.

Contrary to the prophecy of Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad, Allāh ﷻ showered many favours on Maulānā Chiniotī. A few of them are presented below,

1. He was elected a member of the provincial assembly of Punjab for a second time.
2. He had the honour of performing Hajj on the invitation of Rābitah ‘Ālam Islāmī.
3. He met the Shaykh-ul-Azhar in Egypt and turned his attention towards Qādiyānism. He also made him aware of the plot of the Qādiyānīs.
4. He once again called out to Mirzā Tāhir on 13 August 1989 C.E. However, he (Mirzā Tāhir) did not have the courage to come forward.
5. On 29 August 1988 C.E Allāh ﷻ bestowed Maulānā Chiniotī with his first grandson. In remembrance of the ordinance on the prohibition of Qādiyānism, Maulānā Chiniotī kept his name Muhammad Diyā-ul-Haq.

In accordance with the way of his grandfather, Mirzā Tāhir made a false statement at the annual gathering (of the Qādiyanīs). He said, ‘Maulānā Manzūr Chiniotī continued to make different excuses in order to flee from the *Mubāhalah*.’

This statement, which is a complete lie, was published in the daily ‘Jang’ in London on 13 August 1995 C.E.

The reality is that for the past forty years, Maulānā Chiniotī has been inviting (the father of Mirzā Tāhir)

Mirzā Mahmūd, Mirzā Nāsir and Mirzā Tāhir himself for a *Mubāhalah*. However, none of them proved to be a warrior of the field. Right up to this day, Mirzā Tāhir himself does not have the courage to come forward.

Whilst practicing on the famous proverb ‘a liar should be transported to his home’, Maulānā Chiniotī once again invited Mirzā Tāhir that he should come on 5 August 1995 C.E to Hyde Park London for *Mubāhalah*. The invitation was also published in the daily ‘Jang’ London on 4 August 1995 C.E. Maulānā Chiniotī Sāhib, Maulānā Diyā’ Qāsmī Sāhib, Shaykh Maulānā ‘Abdul Hafīz Makkī Sāhib, Maulānā Qārī Muhammad Tayyib ‘Abbāsī Sāhib, ‘Allāmah Khālīd Mahmūd Sāhib, Qārī ‘Abdul-Hayy ‘Ābid Sāhib, Miyā Muhammad Ajmal Qādrī Sāhib and other scholars waited from 12 o’clock in the afternoon to 2 o’clock. However, he did not come. On 6 August, the news of this great victory of Maulānā Chiniotī and the disgraceful defeat of Mirzā Tāhir was published in the daily ‘Jang’ London in bold red (letters) with pictures. In the *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* conference the following year, Maulānā Chiniotī made the proposal that if Mirzā Tāhir does not have the courage to come to Hyde Park London, then he is prepared to go to his centre in Telford London for *Mubāhalah*. He should decide on the date and time, and inform Maulānā.

An announcement was made on 9 August 1996 C.E

through the (daily) 'Jang' London. The contents of the announcement is presented in front of the readers,

*'They flee from the name of Mubāhalab
Just as Kufr flees from the Bayt-ul-Harām'ⁱ*

VOL. 25

THE DAILY JANG LONDON

NUMBER 220

FRIDAY 9 AUGUST 1996 C.E. 24 RABĪ-UL-AWWAL 1417 A.H

**A CHALLENGE FOR THE SECOND TIME FOR
MUBĀHALAH FROM MAULĀNĀ MANZŪR
AHMAD CHINIOTĪ TO THE HEAD OF THE
QĀDIYĀNĪS, MIRZĀ TĀHIR AHMAD**

Last year during the annual conference, he (Mirzā Tāhir Ahmad) made a false accusation against me that, 'Manzūr Chiniotī continued to flee from *Mubāhalab*'. To expose this international lie of his, I requested him to come on 5 August 1995 C.E. to Hyde Park London for *Mubāhalab*. Acting in accordance with the announcement, I came with to the place (of *Mubāhalab*) with my companions. We kept waiting. However, he did not have the courage to come. In this manner, their falsehood has become clear to the whole world.

Now I once again invite him that if he himself cannot come to any place to prove the truthfulness of his grandfather Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, then I am ready to go to his centre with my

ⁱ Maulānā Zafar 'Alī Khān

companions for *Mubāhalah*. He should decide on the date and time, and inform me at my address in Chiniot Pakistan. I will wait for his answer so that it can once again become clear to the world that who is the one who flees from *Mubāhalah*.

Manzūr Ahmad Chinotī

(General Secretary of International Khatm-e-Nubuwwat Movement)

CONCLUSION

The discussion on the truthfulness and falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has come to an end here. If the (stated) details and answers (of the discussion) are remembered, then no Mirzā'ī debater would be able face a challenge. The condition is that he (the Mirzā'ī debater) should be entangled in this discussion with complete steadfastness, courage and vigour. He should not be allowed to enter into any other topic. If he tries to move this way or that way, then a subtle manner and counter questioning should be adopted to force him to speak on this topic. *Insha Allāh*, the details stated above would prove to be very beneficial for the debate. However, these details should not be regarded as the final word. They are just a few examples, otherwise there are innumerable proofs on the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, for example, prohibition of *Jihād*, contradictions of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, Disrespect to the Sahābah

ﷺ and *Ahl-ul-Bayt*, disrespect to the *Ambiyā'* ﷺ, refutation of miracles (*Mu'jizāt*), drinking wine, showing off, intermingling with non-Mahram women, obedience to the British etc. A little bit of detail (on these subjects) can be found in *Muhammadiyyah Pocket Book* and complete detail can be found in the book of Maulānā Mushtāq Ahmad, *Ā'inah Qādiyāniyat*.

ANALYSIS OF THE PROOFS SHOWING THE TRUTHFULNESS OF MIRZĀ

Proof One:

In response to the disbelievers of Makkah, Rasūlullāh ﷺ presented the following verse as a proof,

﴿فَقَدْ لَبِثْتُ فِيكُمْ عُمُرًا مِّن قَبْلِهِ أَفَلَا تَعْقِلُونَ﴾ يونس: ١٦

I have lived my life amongst you before this, do you not understand?

Explanation: The life of a Nabī being free of any blemish before *Nubuwwat* is sufficient for his truthfulness. No regard is given to the accusations made later on. We also say the same thing, that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had no blemish on him prior to his claim to *Nubuwwat*. The people made accusations later on, which were baseless. Therefore, he is truthful.

Answer 1:

The questions that the king of Rome, Heraclius, asked the Arab delegation regarding Rasūlullāh ﷺ, some of them were related to the life of Rasūlullāh ﷺ after *Nubuwwat*, for example, did any of his followers leave him after becoming upset with him? Are his followers increasing or decreasing?

After narrating this Hadīth, the Sahābah رضى الله عنهم did not express any kind of displeasure at the thoughts of Heraclius.

Answer 2:

In this proof (of his), the Qādiyānī preacher has shown disrespect towards Rasūlullāh ﷺ by comparing Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. In response to this (proof), we find it sufficient to present the text of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī,

‘Except for it, the person who is a follower of a Nabī and he believes in his commands and the book of Allāh, to term his tests as being similar to the tests of the *Ambiyā*’ is a type of misunderstanding.’ⁱ

Therefore, we cannot compare Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī with Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

ⁱ Ā’inah Kamālāt-Islām p.339, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.1 p.339

Answer 3:

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī states,

فلا تقيسوني على أحد ولا أحد بي

Do not compare me to anyone and do not compare anyone with me.ⁱ

Therefore, the Mirzā's should not be bold enough to compare Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī with Rasūlullāh ﷺ. If they would do this, then they would be disobeying Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

Answer 4:

The life of a Nabī is pure before and after *Nubuwwat*. The life before *Nubuwwat* is proven to be pure so that the future life can be shown as untainted and the claim of *Nubuwwat* can be accepted.

It is a very weak point to flee from discussing the life after *Nubuwwat*. It is an indication that certainly there is some dark side to his life.

Answer 5:

In his earlier life, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī fought a case in the British court and attained some inheritance, whilst the reality is that a Nabī does not

ⁱ Khutbah Ilhāmīyah p.52

inherit from anyone.

الأنبياء لا نورث^١ ولا نورث نحن معشر

*We the group of Ambiyā', we do not inherit from anyone
and no one inherits from us.*

Answer 6:

It is a fact that the life of a Nabī is pure before *Nubuwwat* and his life after the claim to *Nubuwwat* is also pure. However, it is not necessary that a person whose earlier life is pure becomes a Nabī. Just as it is necessary that a Nabī is not a poet, he does not learn to read and write from anyone and he does not speak lies. However, a person who is not a poet, who did not learn how to read and write from anyone, it is not necessary that he becomes a Nabī. This is because if this point is accepted, then today one would find thousands of people who claim that their earlier lives were pure.

ⁱ It should be clear that in the books of Ahādīth the words لا نورث do not appear. The words لا نورث appear. However, on page 245 of the Tablīghī pocket book of the Mirzā'īs under the heading of the orchard of Fidak the words لا نورث و لا نورث have been transmitted. Therefore, we have made it the basis of our answer. It is the responsibility of the Mirzā'īs to prove (these words). We also come to know of the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī through the words of the authentic narration لا نورث, because his children inherited from him after his death. In short, this Hadīth is a proof to the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī in all aspects.

Would they all be accepted as Nabīs?

Answer 7:

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself concedes that no one besides the *Ambiyā'* ﷺ is infallible (Ma'sūm). (He says,) neither am I infallible, and this is an accepted rule. المرء يؤخذ باقرارهⁱ

Check Karāmāt-us-Sādiqīn page 5.

‘However, it is a pity that Batālwī Sāhib did not understand that no person after the *Ambiyā'* ﷺ can claim to be infallible.’

Is this not a clear admission to not being infallible?

Answer 8:

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself admits that he spent a long period in obscurity.

‘It was the period when no one knew me. No one was in conformity with me and no one was against me, because I was a non-entity at that time. I was an individual from amongst the people and I was concealed in the corner of obscurity.’

He further clarifies on the same page,

‘All the people of this district and thousands of other

ⁱ A person is caught out through his admission.

people are aware that at that time I was like a dead person who had been buried hundreds of years ago and (now) no one knows whose grave it is.”ⁱ

Now decide for yourself, a person who is like an unknown dead person and no one knows him, what regard is there for the life of such a person? Can this life of obscurity be used as a proof to any claim of his?

We also come to know from here that a person who was buried hundreds of years ago, generally it is not known whose grave it is. Then how could one grave in Srinagar be accepted?

Besides this, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has admitted on different occasions that no one knew him before he received inspiration and the command of Allāh ﷻ. No one was in conformity with him or against him. In fact, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was passing his life like a normal person. He had no superiority over anyone? Now how can it be correct to present such a lifestyle as a proof for his claim?

Answer 9:

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was disobedient to his mother in his earlier life. Take a look at this quotation, ‘Our mother related to me, a few old women told me

ⁱ Supplement (Tatimmah) Haqīqat-ul-Wahī vol.22 p.460

(her) that once during his childhood Hadrat Sāhib (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) asked his mother for something to eat with bread. She said, “Take this”. Perhaps it was jaggery. Hadrat replied, “No. I will not take it.” She mentioned a different thing. Hadrat Sāhib gave the same reply. Due to some occurrence, she was angry at that time. She said in a stern way, “Then go and eat the bread with ash.” Hadrat Sāhib sat down and placed the ash on the bread. It then became a pleasantry in the house.ⁱ

See, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī did not eat the thing that was meant to be consumed, i.e. the jaggery. He placed the thing that was not meant to be consumed (i.e. the ash) on the bread. This can only be the actions of a person who has lost his human nature. Every person of intelligence would understand that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī’s mother did not intend that he should eat the bread with the ash. In fact, when she became tired of his stubbornness, she taunted him in this manner. This incident is a proof of the foolishness, crooked nature and disobedience of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Can this be the objective of,

﴿وَخَفِضْ لَهُمَا جَنَاحَ الذُّلِّ مِنَ الرَّحْمَةِ﴾ الإسراء: ٢٤

ⁱ Sīrat-ul-Mahdī vol.1 p.245

Lower for them the wings of humility

Was any Nabī disobedient to his mother, specifically in an act of obedience?

Answer 10:

In his earlier (obscure) life, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was a kind of an unrestrained tourer. His own son writes,

‘My mother related to me, once during his younger days Hadrat Masīh (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) went to collect the pension of your grandfather. Mirzā Imām-ud-Dīn also went behind him. When he collected the pension, then he (Mirzā Imām-ud-Dīn) deceived him (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) and instead of bringing him to Qādiyān, he took him out. He made him tour here and there. When he used up all the money, he left him and went away. Due to this embarrassment, Hadrat Masīh did not return home.’ⁱ

It should be borne in mind that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī’s age at that time was twenty-four (24) or twenty-five (25). The reason being that according to his own writings he was born in 1839 C.E or 1840 C.E.ⁱⁱ It

ⁱ Sīrat-ul-Mahdī vol.1 p.154

ⁱⁱ Check footnotes of Kitāb-ul-Bariyyah p.159, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.13 p.177

is recorded in *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī*ⁱ (vol.1 p.154) that the date of employment of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is 1864 C.E. This incident took place a little before he took up employment. It should also be kept in mind that this pension amount was no insignificant amount. In fact, it was seven hundred (700) Rupees, which is equal to seven hundred thousand (700 000) Rupees of today.ⁱⁱ

Now, keep in mind the age of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and this large sum of money, and reflect on the underlined words (above), that in what type of touring did Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī spend all this money? Was Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī a child at that time, that someone could deceive him? And what then is the meaning of making him tour here and there? It is certain that this amount was not spent in any *Dīnī* work or *Masjid* and *Madrasah*, neither was it spent in any good work. If the red-light district is not meant by 'here and there', then which other place did Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī like? If the actions were not shameful then why did Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī become embarrassed, which caused him to flee to Sialkot?

ⁱ *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī*, vol.1 p.43

ⁱⁱ Check *Sīrat-ul-Mahdī* vol.1 p.131

Now, our question to the Mirzā'is is that they should explain where this large amount (of money) was spent, otherwise Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī would no longer remain infallible and the claim that his life before the claim to *Nubuwwat* was unsullied would become invalid.

Answer 11:

Rasūlullāh ﷺ first called the members of his house and presented his honesty in front of them. They all said with one voice,

جربناك مرارا فما وجدنا فيك إلا صدقا

We have dealt with you many times and we have always found honesty in you.

Contrary to this, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī presented his truthfulness through Maulwī Muhammad Husayn Batālwīⁱ, who stayed with him only for a short period of time. He did not even reside in the city and

ⁱ Whilst retracting from his praises for Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, Maulānā Muhammad Husayn Batālwī wrote, 'Other than false beliefs that are contrary to Islām and the previous religions, speaking lies and deceiving people has become such an essential trait of yours as though it is a part of your nature. Before the period in which *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* was written, I was not fully aware of your life. (A letter to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, quoted in *Ā'inah Kamālāt-Islām* p.311, *Rūhānī Khazā'in* vol.5 p. 311)

village of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. There is also no doubt that he retracted from his previous writings when the true face of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī came to the fore.ⁱ

Similarly, Sayyidunā Abū Sufyān ؓ spoke about the pure life of Rasūlullāh ؐ in front of the King Heraclius before he accepted Islām. In the same manner, Sayyidah Khadījah ؓ spoke about the earlier pure life of Rasūlullāh ؐ when Jibrīl ؑ first came with revelation to Rasūlullāh ؐ. Similarly, Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah ؓ speaks about the latter life and the entire life of Rasūlullāh ؐ being pure,

كان خلقه القرآن

The character of Rasūlullāh ؐ was the Noble Qur’ān

MIRZĀ QĀDIYĀNĪ TREATS HIS WIVES IN CONFLICT WITH THE SHARĪ’AH

After the birth of Fadl Ahmad, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī separated from his first wife, the mother of Fadl Ahmad and Sultān Ahmad. The separation lasted approximately thirty-three (33) years. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī did not divorce her; neither did he treat her as a wife. He continued acting contrary to,

ⁱ Check Ā’inah Kamālāt-Islām

﴿فَلَا تَمِيلُوا كُلَّ الْمِيلِ فَتَذَرُوهَا كَالْمُعَلَّقَةِ﴾ النساء: ١٢٩

*Do not lean towards one completely, leaving the other one
like hanging*

(and he continued acting contrary to,)

﴿وَعَاشِرُوهُنَّ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ﴾ النساء: ١٩

And live with them in kindness

First Citation:

‘Hāfiz Nūr Muhammad, a resident of Faizullah Chak mentioned to me that the promised Messiah stated a number of times that Sultān Ahmad (Mirzā Sultān Ahmad Sāhib) is sixteen (16) years younger than me and Fadl Ahmad is twenty (20) years (younger than me). Thereafter, we had no relationship with our household.’ⁱ

Second Citation:

‘Our mother mentioned to me that from the beginning, the promised Messiah had disinclination towards the mother of Mirzā Fadl Ahmad, whom the people would call Phajedī Mā. The reason being that the relatives of Hadrat Sāhib (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) had a disinclination towards *Dīn*, (i.e. the self-proclaimed *Dīn* of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī), and she had an

ⁱ Sīrat-ul-Mahdī vol.2 p. 63

inclination towards them. She was influenced by them. Therefore, the promised Messiah left out physical contact with her.ⁱ

Why would the people who would call this poor woman Phajedī Mā come to the house of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī? This is not the subject of discussion now.

Then it is stated after a few lines,

‘Until the question of Muhammadī Begum arose, and his relatives acted against him and had Muhammadī Begum married someone else, and the mother of Fadl Ahmad did not break relations with him. In fact she stayed with him. Then, Hadrat Sāhib (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) divorced her.’ⁱⁱ

It is a lie that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī divorced her because she did not break relations with him. In fact, he divorced in the love of Muhammadī Begum.

Where would the wife of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī who was aware of his hidden secrets bring faith in his deception when he destroyed thirty-three (33) years of her life and then divorced her when she became old? This is the character of Mirzā Ghulām

ⁱ Sīrat-ul-Mahdī vol.1 p.33

ⁱⁱ Sīrat-ul-Mahdī vol.2 pp.33-34

Ahmad Qādiyānī!ⁱ

Answer 12:

How would this verse be a proof to the truthfulness of Rasūlullāh ﷺ for the people who accepted Islām seven (7) to eight (8) years after Rasūlullāh ﷺ made a claim to *Nubuwwat*?

﴿فَقَدْ لَبِثْتُ فِيكُمْ عُمُرًا مِّن قَبْلِهِ ۖ أَفَلَا تَعْقِلُونَ﴾ يونس: ١٦

I have lived my life amongst you before this, do you not understand?

This would only be possible when the life of Rasūlullāh ﷺ also remained untainted after the claim to *Nubuwwat*; otherwise this verse would be specific to the people of the time in which Rasūlullāh ﷺ made this statement.

The question then arises that which verse makes this verse specific? The Qādiyānīs have not presented any proof for it up to this day, neither have they retracted from this incorrect reasoning of theirs. They have reached the heights of shamelessness.

ⁱ Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī divorced Phajedī Ma in 1891 C.E. It was during this year that Muhammadi Begum married Sultān Ahmad. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī married Nusrat Jahā Begum in 1884 C.E.

SECOND PROOF

Allāh ﷻ states in the Noble Qur’ān,

﴿وَلَوْ تَقَوَّلَ عَلَيْنَا بَعْضَ الْأَقَاوِيلِ ﴿٤٦﴾ لَأَخَذْنَا مِنْهُ بِالْيَمِينِ ﴿٤٧﴾ ثُمَّ لَقَطَعْنَا مِنْهُ الْوَتِينَ ﴿٤٨﴾﴾ الحاقة:

٤٦ - ٤٨

*And if Muhammad had made up about Us some [false]
sayings*

We would have seized him by the right hand;

Then We would have cut from him the aorta

In this verse Allāh ﷻ says that if Muhammad ﷺ would have made any false attribution towards Him, then He would have cut his jugular vein and destroyed him. This establishes the point that had Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made a false attribution towards Allāh ﷻ, then he would have been destroyed within twenty-three (23) years and his jugular vein would have been cut. The reason being that Rasūlullāh ﷺ remained alive for twenty-three years (23) after *Nubuwwat*, and this verse is related to this particular portion of his life.

Answer 1:

The Mirzā’ī preacher wants to compare Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī with the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ, whilst Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself admits that his *Nubuwwat* is not similar to the *Nubuwwat* of the previous *Ambiyā’* ﷺ. Therefore, it would be useless to

make the comparison.

We had cut the first proof of the Mirzā'is through this proof. Now their second proof has also been cut with the same knife.

ما نعننى من النبوة ما يعنى فى الصحف الأولىⁱ

‘It should be remembered that many people are deceived when they hear the word Nabī in my claim and they think that it is as though I have made a claim to the *Nubuwwat* which the *Ambiyā’* of the previous times directly received. However, they are incorrect in this thought of theirs.ⁱⁱ

When his *Nubuwwat* is not the *Nubuwwat* of the previous (*Ambiyā’* ﷺ), then how would it be correct to make those believers the benchmark for his *Nubuwwat*?

Answer 2:

When one looks at the context of the verse, then it becomes clear that this command of Allāh ﷻ is not a general principle (*Qā'idah Kulliyyah*). In fact, it is a *Qadhiyyah Shakhsiyyah* and it is specific with Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The reason being that it was stated in the Bible that the messenger who would come later on, if he would

ⁱ Al-Istiftā' – addendum to Haqīqat-ul-Wahī p.16, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.22 p.637

ⁱⁱ Footnotes of Haqīqat-ul-Wahī p.154

make a false claim to *Nubuwwat* then he would be destroyed in a short period of time. Accordingly, take a look at the following text,

‘I will send to them a Nabī like you from amongst their brethren and I will place my speech in his mouth. Whatever I will say to him (i.e. Muhammad ﷺ), he will say all of it to them (i.e. his *Ummah*). The person who will not listen to my message which he will deliver in my name, I will take that person to account. However, the Nabī who will be arrogant and say such a thing in my name which I did not command him to say or say something in the name of other deities, then that Nabī will be killed.’ⁱ

Answer 3:

If this principle of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is accepted, then many true *Ambiyā’* ﷺ, may Allāh ﷻ protect us, would become liars, for example, Sayyidunā Yahyā ﷺ and many other *Isrā’īlī Ambiyā’* ﷺ were martyred at a very young age after making the claim to *Nubuwwat*. If the principle of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is accepted, then it as though these *Ambiyā’* ﷺ were not true. On the contrary, Bahā-ullāh Īrānī (who made a claim to *Nubuwwat*) who remained alive for forty (40) years after making the claim to *Nubuwwat*

ⁱ Bible p.188

would be true (in his claim) according to this principle of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, whilst the Mirzā's believe him to be a liar.ⁱ

Bahā-ullāh made the claim of being the promised Messiah in 1269 A.H and he remained alive until 1309 A.H. This life of his after *Nubuwwat* equals forty (40) years. It is a period much lengthier than twenty-three (23) years.

Answer 4:

In the light of this proof of his, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself becomes a liar. His claim to *Nubuwwat* is a contentious matter because his followers are split into two groups. The Lāhorī group does not accept him to be a Nabī although Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself has no doubt in his own claim to *Nubuwwat*. On the contrary, the Qādiyānī group accepts him to be a Nabī. They say that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made the claim to *Nubuwwat* in 1901 C.E. and he died in 1908 C.E. Therefore, it is established that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī turned out to be false in this proof of his, because he died from cholera before completing twenty-three (23) years.

ⁱ Check Akhbār-ul-Hikam p.4 - 24 October 1904 C.E as a reference for Bahā-ullāh Īrānī remaining alive for forty (40) years.

Answer 5:

Granted that it is a general principle, then it would be regarding the true *Ambiyā'* and not regarding false Nabīs, because this principle is not against false Nabīs receiving respite. Fir'awn, Namrūd and Bahā-ullāh etc received a great amount of respite despite their claims to divinity and *Nubuwwat*. When the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has been established through other proofs, then this principle will also not apply to him.

MIRZĀ'Ī EXCUSE

The scholars made an objection on Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī that if this principle of yours is general and correct, then why were these false claimants of *Nubuwwat* not killed within twenty-three (23) years? Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī replied that you should prove that together with the claim to *Nubuwwat*, they also made the claim of revelation coming to them and then too they remained alive for twenty-three (23) years, because our discussion is regarding revelation (*wahī*) and not regarding a general claim (to *Nubuwwat*). Check *Tatimmah Arba'in Dar Rūhānī Khazā'in*.ⁱ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes,

ⁱ *Tatimmah Arba'in, Rūhānī Khazā'in* vol.17 p.477

‘It is established from here that all the pure books of Allāh ﷻ are unanimous on this point that a false Nabī gets destroyed. Now to counter it with the question that King Akbar made a claim to *Nubuwwat* or Roshan Dīn Jālandharī made a claim to *Nubuwwat* or so and so person made a claim to *Nubuwwat* and they were not destroyed, this is another type of foolishness. If it is true that they made a claim to *Nubuwwat* and they were not destroyed within twenty-three (23) years, then firstly their claim should be established through their writings, and the inspiration (*Ilhām*) which they stated in the name of Allāh ﷻ should be presented, i.e. they said that revelation came to me in these words that I am the messenger of Allāh. The original words and the complete proof to the revelation should be presented, because our discussion is regarding revelation.’ⁱ

Answer:

It should be remembered that this text is in our favour because the Mirzā’is present the writings of 1901 C.E or later as proof to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī being the messenger of Allāh, and the true facts are that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made a claim to *Nubuwwat* in 1901 C.E and he died from cholera in 1908 C.E. Therefore, his own writings have placed a seal

ⁱ Adendum to Tuhfah Golrawiyyah vol.17 p.39-40

on his falsehood.

THIRD PROOF

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said that the sign of *Mahdī* is that during his time there will be a lunar and solar eclipse in Ramadhān. This sign is evident in Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Never before did it occur this way. This establishes the point that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is the true *Mahdī* according to the Hadīth.

Answer 1:

Certainly this is not a Hadīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. In fact, it is a statement of Sayyidunā Muhammad Bāqir ؑ, which has a weak status. Imām Ad-Dār Qutnī ؑ has recorded it (this statement) in his book. Therefore, to present this statement as a Hadīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, not only is it a great false accusation on Rasūlullāh ﷺ, but according to the Hadīth, من كذب علي متعمدا الخ (the one who knowingly speaks a lie against me.....), it is preparing one's abode in *Jahannam*.

Answer 2:

This statement of Sayyidunā Muhammad Bāqir ؑ is rejected due to its chain of transmission. The statement is,

عن عمرو بن شمر عن جابر عن محمد بن علي قال إن لمهديننا آيتين لم تكونا منذ

خلق الله السموات و الارض تنكسف القمر لأول ليلة من رمضان و تنكسف
الشمس في نصف منه و لم تكونا منذ خلق السموات و الارضⁱ

The first narrator, ‘Amr Ibn Shimr, in *Mizānul-I’tidāl*ⁱⁱ it is stated regarding him,

ليس بشيء زائع كذاب رافضي يشتم الصحابة و يروي الموضوعات عن
الثقات منكر الحديث لا يكتب حديثه متروك الحديث

It is clear from these remarks of ‘Allāmah Dhahabī رحمته الله that he (‘Amr Ibn Shimr) is not a credible narrator.

The second narrator is Jābir. There are many narrators who have this name. It is not known which Jābir is referred to here. He is an unknown (*Majhūl*) person. Yes, one of them (the Jābirs) is Jābir Ju’fī, regarding whom Imām Abū Hanīfah رحمته الله has said, “I have not seen a bigger liar than Jābir Ju’fī.” This is also the condition of the third narrator. There are many narrators who have the name Muhammad Ibn ‘Alī. There is no proof to establish that the ‘Muhammad’ in this narration refers to Muhammad Bāqir, because it was the habit of ‘Amr Ibn Shimr to attribute fabricated (*Mawdū’*) narations towards credible (*Thiqah*) narrators. Therefore, how can on use such a narration as a proof?

ⁱ Ad-Dār Qutnī vol.1 p.188

ⁱⁱ *Mizānul-I’tidāl* vol.2 p.262

Answer 3:

Granted that it is the statement of Muhammad Bāqir, then too, one of the signs on the falsehood of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is that the eclipse did not occur place on the stated dates of Ramadhān. During the time of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, the lunar eclipse took place on the 13th of Ramadhān and the solar eclipse occurred on the 28th of Ramadhān, whilst it is clear in the statement that the lunar eclipse will occur on the 1st of Ramadhān and the solar eclipse will occur on the 15th, and that such an occurrence would have never happened before.

MIRZĀ'Ī EXCUSE

Generally a lunar eclipse always occurs on the 13th, 14th or 15th of the lunar month and a solar eclipse occurs on the 27th, 28th or 29th. Therefore, لاول ليلة refers to the first night from the dates in which the eclipse occurs, i.e. the 13th night, and نصف منه refers to the 28th night. During the time of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī the eclipse occurred 13th and 28th, which is in accordance with statement of Imām Muhammad Bāqir عليه السلام.

Answer 1:

The words of the narration do not accept this absurd interpretation. Sayyidunā Muhammad Bāqir عليه السلام said أول ليلة من رمضان, which means the first night of Ramadhān. He

did not say أول ليلة من ليالى الكسوف, which could then refer to the 13th night. No person refers to the 13th of Ramadhān as the 1st of Ramadhān. Similarly, في نصف منه refers to the middle of Ramadhān, i.e. the 15th. It does not refer to the 28th, which is the final day of Ramadhān (and not the middle). Who would explain to the ignorant people?

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NISF & WAST

‘*Wast*’ refers to something in the middle. ‘*Nisf*’ refers to one part of two equal parts. Sayyidunā Muhammad Bāqir ؑ has said, ‘*Nisf* of Ramadhān’, which would be the 15th. The 27th, 28th and 29th are the days of eclipse. The 28th is the middle day between the 27th and 29th. Neither is it the *Nisf* of these three days nor is it the *Nisf* of Ramadhān. It is not correct in any way to refer to the 28th as the *Nisf* of Ramadhān. It is sheer deception.

Answer 2:

The interpretation of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is incorrect because this sentence has come twice in this statement, لم تكونا منذ خلق الله السموات و الارض, i.e. the *Mahdī* will have two such signs that were never seen since the creation of the heavens and earth. This statement can only be correct when the apparent meaning of it is taken, i.e. the 1st and 15th of Ramadhān, because since

the creation of the heavens and earth there has never been a lunar and solar eclipse on these dates. Before (the time of) Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, there were many instances when a lunar eclipse occurred on the 13th and a solar eclipse occurred on the 28th. Hence the book of Mr. Keith, 'Use of the Globes' and (the book) *Hadā'iq-un-Nujūm*, both make mention of the eclipses that took place from 1801 C.E to 1901 C.E. The book '*Dūsri Shihādāt-Āsmānī*' of Sayyid Abū Ahmad Rahmānī has the list of the eclipses of forty-five (45) of these years. The list is on pages 15 to 22 of the book. In these forty-five (45) years, the first lunar eclipse occurred on 13 July 1851 C.E corresponding to 13 Ramadhān 1267 A.H and the solar eclipse occurred on the 28th of Ramadhān. Then, the second lunar eclipse occurred on 21 March 1894 C.E corresponding 13 Ramadhān 1311 A.H and the solar eclipse occurred on 6 April corresponding to 28 Ramadhān 1311 A.H. Then, the third lunar eclipse occurred on 11 March 1895 C.E corresponding to 13 Ramadhān 1312 A.H and the solar eclipse occurred on 26 March corresponding to 28 Ramadhān 1312 A.H. According to the list given in the book of Mr. Kieth, 'Use of the Globes' and '*Hadā'iq-un-Nujūm*', three eclipses occurred in a short period of forty-five (45) years. We come to know from here that many other eclipses must have occurred on these dates prior to this.

AN IMPORTANT RULE

The encyclopaedia Britannica has recorded the eclipses that occurred (from) seven hundred and sixty-three (763) years before Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ until 1901 C.E. It is stated thereafter, every established or accepted eclipse, the same type of eclipse occurs 223 years before and after, i.e. the accepted eclipse in whichever month, condition and time it occurred, then 223 years before and after an eclipse will occur with the same specifications. Now, let us ponder in the light of this calculation that when between 1267 C.E and 1312 C.E, in forty-five (45) years, the eclipses occurred three (3) times together on 13 and 28 Ramadhān, then the times in which the eclipses occurred together on 13 and 28 Ramadhān could be deduced from the rule. We present the calculation and the name of a few claimants below. Only the experts of the calendar would be able to deduce how many actually occurred.

NUMBER	LUNAR OR SOLAR	COMPLETE OR PARTIAL	YEAR C.E	YEAR A.H	GREGORIAN		HIJRĪ		TIME	
					MONTH	DATE	MONTH	DATE		
1	Lunar	Partial	1851	1267	July	13	Ramadhān	13	After midnight	*
	Solar		1851	1267	July	28	Ramadhān	28	After midday	
2	Lunar	Partial	1894	1311	March	21	Ramadhān	13	After midnight	* *
	Solar		1894	1311	April	6	Ramadhān	28	After midday	
3	Lunar	Complete	1895	1312	March	11	Ramadhān	28	After midnight	* *
	Solar		1895	1312	March	26	Ramadhān	28		

* This eclipse occurred in India before Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made his claim. He was eleven (11) or twelve (12) years old at that time.

** This eclipse did not occur in India. In fact it occurred in America when Mr. Dooi, who claimed to be the Messiah, was there.

*** This eclipse occurred in India. However, it cannot be the substantiation of the Hadīth because similar eclipses occurred before it within one century.

1. In 117 A.H corresponding to 736 C.E an eclipse occurred on the 13th and 28th of Ramadhān. A king by the name of Dharīf was present at that time. He claimed to be a Nabī who had received a *sharī'ah*. When he died in 126 A.H, his son Sālih became the king.

In 346 A.H corresponding to 959 C.E an eclipse occurred on the same dates of Ramadhān. Abū Mansūr 'Īsā who claimed to be Nabī was present at that time.

2. According to the second diagram, according to the eclipses that occurred in 1311 A.H corresponding to 1894 C.E, the first eclipse occurred in 161 A.H corresponding to 779 A.H on the same dates of Ramadhān. A person by the name of Sālih who made the claim of *Nubuwwat* was present at that time. During his time, an eclipse occurred twice on these dates of Ramadhān, just as it is the case with Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, i.e. an eclipse occurred in 127 A.H and then in 162 A.H. Then, it occurred in 1311 A.H corresponding to 1894 C.E. However, it did not occur in India. In fact it

occurred in America. Mr. Dooi who made the false claim of being the promised Messiah was there at that time.

3. According to the third diagram, an eclipse occurred in 162 A.H corresponding to 780 C.E. Sālih made the claim (to *Nubuwwat*) at that time. The second eclipse occurred in 1312 A.H corresponding to 1895 C.E in which Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was the false claimant to *Nubuwwat*.



CHAPTER FOUR

THE ASCENSION AND DESCENT OF
SAYYIDUNĀ ‘ĪSĀ ﷺ

Before discussing with the Mirzā’is the topic on the life and death of Sayyidūna ‘Īsā ﷺ or the topic of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*, it is necessary to make sure that if both parties are going to explain the verses of the Noble Qur’ān through their own thoughts and opinions, then there would be no real benefit in the discussion. They will give their explanation and we will give our explanation, and nothing will be attained from the discussion. Therefore, it is preferable to choose such *Mufasssirīn* and *Mujaddidīn* of the (previous) thirteen (13) centuries whose statements are accepted by both parties.

Certainly the statements of the *Mufasssirīn* and *Mujaddidīn* of the fourteenth century should not be accepted. In fact, a *Mufasssir* and *Mujaddid* should be chosen from the (previous) thirteen (13) centuries, before (the time of) Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. He should be such (a personality) whose explanation and commentary is accepted by both parties, and it should be regarded as the final word. We will select

those *Mujaddidīn* whom are accepted by both parties. The list of the *Mujaddidīn* who are accepted by the Mirzā'īs is found in the book '*Asl Musaffā*'. It should be clear that the book '*Asl Musaffā*' was written by the disciple (Murīd) of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, Mirzā Khudā Bakhsh. Whatever portion would be written each day, it would be read out to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. If coincidentally the written portion was not read out to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī on a certain day, then Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī would enquire about it with great importance, that why did you not read the book to me today? In short, the entire book (was read out to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and) he heard it attentively. It is as though it is the authenticated book of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

Therefore, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has accepted the *Mujaddidīn* listed in the book.ⁱ

CLARIFYING THE TOPIC

In order to lead the masses astray and to confuse the scholars who have not done in-depth research, the Mirzā'īs generally touch on the ineffectual topic of whether Sayyidūnā 'Īsā ﷺ is alive or not? They have

ⁱ For clarification check the book '*Asl Musaffā*', author Mirzā Khudā Bakhsh, vol.1 p.117

selected this topic to remain in the debate for a little while by taking support from unestablished and farfetched interpretations. They also wish to place their awe on the masses. On such an occasion, it is the duty of the Muslim debater to leave no stone unturned in throwing water over the wish of the Mirzā'ī speaker. Instead of discussing this matter, he should first try to keep an eye on the proofs presented in the beginning (of the book), regarding specifying the topic. In the light of these proofs, he should try to make the discussion revolve around the character of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, rather than the pure being of Sayyidunā 'Isā ﷺ. If it is proven from his writings that he was a true and honourable person, then certainly this matter can be discussed thereafter. However, if he is not found to be an honourable and true person, then why the need to waste time in discussing a matter that in the words of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī 'has no connection with Islām, neither is it a part of our *īmān*, neither is there any sin on this type of belief because it was the belief of some of the Sahābah'. It would be very good if the Muslim debater succeeds in this way. However, if this cannot be achieved due to some constraints, then (the Muslim debater) should discuss this topic. He should first clarify the topic by blocking the feeble interpretations of the Mirzā'īs, by stating that the original difference between us and the Mirzā'īs is not regarding the life and death of Sayyidunā 'Isa ﷺ, in

fact it is regarding his ascension to the heavens whilst he was alive and his descent close to *Qiyāmah*. The reason for this is that even if we prove that Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ is alive, then too, our claim would not be complete until we prove his ascension to the heavens and descent. Similarly, granted that the Mirzā’is establish the death of Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ, then too their claim does not become complete until they disprove his ascension and descent. The mere establishment of his death will not negate his ascension and descent because the Christians also believe in the ascension and descent of Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ. However, they also believe in his death, that before his ascension he remained dead for three (3) days. The real difference is in the ascension and descent and not in being alive and (or) having passed on. Therefore, the original point of difference should be kept in mind during the discussion, which is that the topic of discussion should be ‘ascension and descent’, rather than ‘passed away or alive’. *Inshā Allāh* the Mirzā’i debater will be shaken when the topic is identified because it is not that easy to make absurd interpretations in this topic. Therefore, the discussion should be on the ascension and descent. If the ascension and descent is established, then being alive will be established automatically and if the ascension and descent is not established from the Noble Qur’ān, Hadīth and consensus (of the *Ummah*), then death would automatically be understood. Therefore, it would

be a waste of time to discuss alive or having passed on. The original topic of discussion is ‘ascension and descent’ and not ‘having passed on being alive’, which the Qādiyānīs have made through their craftiness. Therefore, it is necessary to correct the topic before the discussion. In order to identify the topic of ascension and descent, we present a few invaluable points below. It is necessary for every Muslim debater to remember them.

INTRODUCTION 1: ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE NOBLE QUR’ĀN

It is clear that the Noble Qur’ān came to decide on all the differences of the people of the book. Allah ﷻ says,

﴿وَمَا أَنزَلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ إِلَّا لِتُبَيِّنَ لَهُمُ الَّذِي اخْتَلَفُوا فِيهِ وَهُدًى وَرَحْمَةً لِّقَوْمٍ يُؤْمِنُونَ﴾ النحل: ٦٤

And We have not revealed to you the Book, [O Muhammad], except for you to make clear to them that wherein they have differed and as guidance and mercy for a people who believe

CONFESSION OF MIRZĀ QĀDIYĀNĪ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has also made the same deduction from the above verse. Check *Izālat-ul-Awhām*

*Dar Rūhānī Khazā'in*ⁱ.

INTRODUCTION 2: MIRZĀ'Ī PRINCIPLE

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī also accepts the principle that because the Noble Qur'ān has come to clarify the matters of dispute of the people of the book, therefore if it does not reject any belief of the people of the book, then its silence on the matter would be regarded as a confirmation. Accordingly, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes,

‘Now we take a look at what the Noble Qur'ān says about the incident of the cross. If it is silent, then it means that the Jews and Christians are correct in their beliefs.’ⁱⁱ

METHOD OF EXTRAPOLATION

It is established from these two points that it is a unanimous belief of ours and the Qādiyanīs that the Noble Qur'ān is the adjudicator for the people of the book and when the Noble Qur'ān does not reject any (specific) belief (of theirs), then it is a proof that the belief is correct.

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awham, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.1 p.234

ⁱⁱ Review of Religions April 1919 no.9 vol.18 pp.149-150

In the light of this unanimous belief we find that the Christians have the following beliefs about Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ:

1. Being God
2. Being the Son (of God)
3. Trinity
4. The cross and expiation
5. Bodily ascension and bodily descentⁱ

ⁱ The three citations presented below should be remembered to find out the above mentioned beliefs of the Christians:

1. “He had said these things, he was lifted up while they were looking on, and a cloud received him out of their sight. And as they were gazing intently into the sky while he was going, behold, two men in white clothing stood beside them. They also said, “Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking into the sky? This Jesus, who has been taken up from you into heaven, will come in just the same way as you have watched him go into heaven.” Bible Acts 1:9-11

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes, ‘During the time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ it was the belief of the Christians that Masīh Ibn Maryam will come again to the world.’

Izālat-ul-Awhām, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 pg.318

إن عقيدة حياته قد جاءت في المسلمين من الملة النصرانية

(The belief that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is alive came to the Muslims from the Christians.)

Addendum to Haqīqat-ul-Wahī vol.22 pg.660

Similarly, the Jews also hold many beliefs regarding Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ. However, it is amazing to note that except for the belief of ascension and descent the Noble Qur'ān has in clear words refuted all the other false beliefs.

1. The Noble Qur'ān has rejected the belief of being God,

﴿لَقَدْ كَفَرَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ هُوَ الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ وَقَالَ الْمَسِيحُ بَنِي إِسْرَءِيلَ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ رَبِّي وَرَبَّكُمْ إِنَّهُ مَنْ يُشْرِكْ بِاللَّهِ فَقَدْ حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ الْجَنَّةَ وَمَأْوَاهُ النَّارُ وَمَا لِلظَّالِمِينَ مِنْ أَنْصَارٍ﴾ المائدة: ٧٢

2. The belief of being the Son (of God) is rejected,

﴿وَقَالَتِ الْيَهُودُ عِزَّى ابْنُ اللَّهِ وَقَالَتِ النَّصَارَى الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ اللَّهِ ذَلِكَ قَوْلُهُمْ بِأَفْوَاهِهِمْ يُضَاهُونَ قَوْلَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْ قَبْلُ قَتَلْنَاهُمْ اللَّهُ أَنْزَلَ يَوْفَكُونَ﴾ التوبة: ٣٠

3. Trinity is rejected,

﴿لَقَدْ كَفَرَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ ثَلَاثُ ثَلَاثَةٍ وَمِمَّنْ إِلَهٌ إِلَّا إِلَهُ وَاحِدٌ وَإِنْ لَمْ يَنْتَهُوا عَمَّا يَقُولُونَ لَيَمَسَّنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ﴾ المائدة: ٧٣

4. The cross and the expiation is rejected,

﴿وَقَوْلِهِمْ إِنَّا قَتَلْنَا الْمَسِيحَ عِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ وَمَا قَتَلُوهُ وَمَا صَلَبُوهُ وَلَٰكِنْ شُبِّهَ لَهُمْ وَإِنَّ الَّذِينَ اخْتَلَفُوا فِيهِ لَفِي شَكٍّ مِّنْهُ مَا لَهُمْ بِهِ مِنْ عِلْمٍ إِلَّا اتِّبَاعَ الظَّنِّ وَمَا قَتَلُوهُ يَقِينًا﴾

النساء: ١٥٧

The Noble Qur'an also rejects the belief of the expiation by saying,

﴿وَلَا تَزِرُ وَازِرَةٌ وِزْرَ أُخْرَىٰ﴾ فاطر: ١٨

However, we do not find in the entire Qur'an or the Ahādīth the refutation of the fifth belief, (which is) 'the ascension and descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ'. In fact, the Noble Qur'an has confirmed it and the Ahādīth clearly support it. If only this much is established that the Noble Qur'an is silent from rejecting this belief, then too it would be confirmed, let alone the Noble Qur'an itself confirming it. The verses *بل رفعه الله إليه* and *و رافعك إلي* bear witness to this. Therefore, according to the verse *و* and according to the principle stated by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, the belief of the Christians regarding the ascension and descent is correct. Now there is no room to refute it. The interpretations of the Mirzā'is in this regard is nothing more than splitting hairs.

The Mirzā'is catch fire when they hear this discussion on the ascension and descent and they begin to make all kinds of efforts to save their Hadrat (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī). You should also keep in mind a few

objections and their answers.

OBJECTIONS FROM MIRZĀ QĀDIYĀNĪ

First Objection:

The demise of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is established from thirty (30) Āyāt of the Noble Qur’ān. Therefore, when it is established that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ passed away, then the belief on the ascension and descent becomes invalid. Therefore, (the belief on) the ascension and descent has been refuted indirectly.

Answer:

Firstly, we do not accept that the Noble Qur’ān has made mention of the demise of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. In fact, his ascension to the heavens is established from the Noble Qur’ān, as will be stated further. Granted that the Noble Qur’ān has made mention of the demise of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ, then too this will not be a refutation of the belief of the Christians, because the Christians themselves believe in the death of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. It is stated in the Bible that he remained in the state of death for three (3) or four (4) days. He was then raised to the heavens. He will descend close to *Qiyāmah*ⁱ. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has also accepted this

ⁱ Luke 23:46-53

in his book *Izālat-ul-Awhām*.ⁱ Therefore, establishing (the) death (of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ) does not invalidate the ascension and descent. Our proof remains intact.

Second Objection:

The reality is that the belief on the ascension and descent is not a unanimous belief amongst the Christians, because Matthew and John (who are both Hawārīs) did not confirm this belief. The Noble Qur’ān refutes those beliefs that are unanimous amongst them. Therefore, we come to know that the belief of the ascent and descent is incorrect.

Answer 1:

This claim is a complete lie. In fact, it is a white lie. It is a triumph for the ignorance of the Mirzā’īs. The belief on the ascension and descent is clearly mentioned in both bibles. Check the Gospel of Matthew (Mattā)ⁱⁱ and the Gospel of John (Yuhannā)ⁱⁱⁱ.

THE POWER OF ALLĀH ﷻ

Answer 2:

It is written in the same book *Izālat-ul-Awhām* that

ⁱ *Izālat-ul-Awhām* vol.3 p. 225

ⁱⁱ Matthew 26:64, 26:24-30

ⁱⁱⁱ John 20:17

there is unanimity between the four gospels. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has written that the ascension and descent is also a unanimous belief of the Christians.

First Citation:

‘All the groupings amongst the Christians seem to be unanimous on this point that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ remained dead for three (3) days and then he was raised from the grave to the heaven. It is also established from the four gospels.’ⁱ

Second Citation:

‘From amongst the testimonies of the Bible that we received (one testimony) is the following verse of the Bible of Matthew (Mattā), ‘And then shall appear the sign of the son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.’ⁱⁱ Check Gospel of Matthewⁱⁱⁱ.

In this citation, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has himself accepted that the ascension and descent of Sayyidūnā ‘Īsā ﷺ is found in the Gospel of Matthew, whilst he was rejecting it in *Izālat-ul-Awhām*.

ⁱ *Izālat-ul-Awhām* vol.3 p.225

ⁱⁱ *Masīh Hindustān Me, Ruhānī Khazā’* in vol.15 p.38

ⁱⁱⁱ Matthew 24:30

Third Citation:

‘We would first like to clarify that according to the Bible and our Ahādīth, two Ambiyā’ ﷺ are believed to have gone to the heavens with their bodies. The first is Yuhanna, whose name is Īlyā and Idrīs. The second is Masīh Ibn Maryam, who is also referred to as ‘Īsa and Yasū.’ⁱ

Therefore, the answer of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī that it is not a unanimous belief of the Christians and that it is stated in two gospels and not stated in the other two, is found to be incorrect through his own admission.

Now the Mirzā’īs should think, are they liars or did their Hadrat Sāhib (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) write lies. Only then should they take up the courage to discuss (the matter) with the Muslims.

Third Mirzā’ī Excuse:

It is the belief of the Jews regarding the messenger Īlyā that he was also raised to the heavens alive. You should prove the refutation of this belief in the Noble Qur’ān. If you cannot find the refutation (of this belief) in the Noble Qur’ān, as is the reality, then you would have to accept that he is also alive in the heavens, whilst (the

ⁱ Tawdhīh Marām p.3, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.52

reality is that) no Muslim holds this view. This point has broken your principle and the proof against our claim, i.e. the death of ‘Īsā ﷺ, could not be established.

Answer 1:

This point would be an objection against us if we made up this principle. This principle is also accepted by your Hadrat (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī), the citation for which passed.

Therefore, you would also have to adopt the belief of the Jews regarding Sayyidunā Īlyā ﷺ, and whatever answer you would give to protect yourselves, you would also have to accept the same answer in our favour.

Answer 2:

The reality of the matter is that it is sheer ignorance to demand a refutation from the Noble Qur’ān for this invalid belief of the Jews. The reason being that the Noble Qur’ān only refutes or confirms those beliefs that are stated in a positive or negative manner in the Noble Qur’ān, for example; the mention of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ and Sayyidah Maryam ﷺ. Contrary to this, there is no mention of the messenger Īlyā in the Noble Qur’ān. Therefore, the refutation (of this belief) would not be searched for in the Noble Qur’ān. Our principle remains intact. Therefore, it is incorrect to compare the messenger Īlyā with Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ.

SUMMARY

It has become clear from the above principle that the matter of discussion between us and the Mirzā'īs is 'the ascension and descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ' and not 'him being dead or alive'. The reasons being that:

1. 'Life and death' is necessary for 'ascension and descent' and not that 'ascension and descent' is necessary for 'life and death'. Therefore, if life and death is discussed, then (the discussion) would not be complete until ascension after being alive (is not established) and negation of the ascension after death is not established. Therefore, 'ascension and descent' would have to be the topic of discussion. This will make the discussion conclusive. It is for this reason that 'ascension and descent' should be made the subject (of discussion).
2. The ascension and descent is the belief of the Christians. The Noble Qur'ān not refuting this belief of theirs and clearly confirming to it is a proof to the correctness of this belief. Now if the Qādiyānīs refute this belief, then they should discuss this topic and (they should) not discuss the matter of life and death, which would produce no results.

We now present the proofs on the ascension and

descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ and (the proofs of) the negation of his death in light of the Noble Qur’ān, Ahādīth, consensus of the *Ummah* and the admission of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

PROOF OF ASCENSION AND DESCENT FROM THE VERSES OF THE NOBLE QUR’ĀN

FIRST PROOF

﴿هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُ بِالْهُدَىٰ وَدِينِ الْحَقِّ لِيُظَاهِرَهُ عَلَى الدِّينِ كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ﴾ التوبة: ٣٣

It is He who has sent His Messenger with guidance and the religion of truth to manifest it over all religion, although they who associate others with Allāh dislike it

From the above verse, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī makes a deduction on the descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ to the world. He writes,

﴿هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُ بِالْهُدَىٰ وَدِينِ الْحَقِّ لِيُظَاهِرَهُ عَلَى الدِّينِ كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ﴾ التوبة: ٣٣

This verse is a prophecy about the physical and political status of Masīh ﷺ. The promise of complete triumph for Islām which has been stated (in this verse), that triumph will be at the hands of Masīh ﷺ. When Masīh ﷺ will come to the world once again, then Islām will

spread in all places at his hands.”ⁱ

It is clear that this verse is a proof for the ascension and descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ, because the descent can only occur once the ascension is established and has already occurred.

SECOND PROOF

﴿عَسَىٰ رَبُّكُمْ أَن يَرْحَمَكُمْ وَإِنْ عُدتُّمْ عُدْنَا﴾ الإسراء: ٨

[Then Allāh said], "It is expected, [if you repent], that your Lord will have mercy upon you. But if you return [to sin], We will return [to punishment]."

According to us, although this verse is not very useful for the matter being discussed, (i.e.) the ascension and descent, however Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has made a deduction on the descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ from this verse. Therefore we have included it in our list (of proofs), because the admission of the opposing party, in whichever way it may be, is also considered a separate proof. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes,

“This verse is an indication to the manifestation of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ in a glorious manner, i.e. if they will not accept the way of kindness and favour, and the truth that has become apparent through clear signs and

ⁱ Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah vol.1 p.593, Chashmah Ma’rifat vol.23 p. 91

open verses...if they remain rebellious, then a time will come when Allāh ﷻ will use hardness and force on the criminals, and Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ will descend to the world in a glorious way and he will clean all the roads and streets from litter.’ⁱ

CONFUSION OF THE MIRZĀ’IS

It is normal for the Mirzā’is to become confused with the above text and deduction of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, because the foundation of their view is destroyed in the presence of these texts. Therefore, they adopt different tactics to save themselves. However, when no tactic works, then the final answer they give is that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī superficially wrote them and he has admitted to this mistake in his book *I’jāz-Ahmadī*.ⁱⁱ

However, it is apparent that this is an excuse for not accepting the truth. The reasons being:

Firstly: This cannot be a superficial belief, because Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has presented verses of the Noble Qur’ān to establish it. Therefore, it is established that he did not accept this belief superficially; in fact, he has accepted it from the Noble

ⁱ Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah vol.4, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.2 p.601-602

ⁱⁱ Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.19 p.113

Qur'ān.

Secondly: The belief on the descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ cannot be classified as an *Ijtihādī* mistake of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, because the book *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* (in which the belief is stated) in the words of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, it has reached the hands of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and he said to Rasūlullāh ﷺ that its name is *Qutbī*, i.e. the book is firm and unshakable like the *Qutb* (Polar) star. It is the book, the complete firmness of which was presented with a notification of ten thousand (10 000) Rupees.ⁱ Therefore, if the belief on the descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ is regarded as superficial, then the book would no longer remain *Qutbī*, neither would the contents of it be firm and unshakable, specifically when Rasūlullāh ﷺ himself saw this book, then how could it be that Rasūlullāh ﷺ overlooked such a serious error (the belief of the descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ), which is a great form of polytheismⁱⁱ according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad

ⁱ Check *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah*, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.1 p.275

ⁱⁱ The citation for terming it a great form of polytheism is,

فمن سوء الادب ان يقال ان عيسى ما مات وان هو الا شرك عظيم ياكل الحسنات و يخالف الحصة بل هو توفي كمثل اخوانه و مات كمثل اهل زمانه و ان عقيدة حياته قد جاءت في المسلمين من الملة النصرانية

(Al-Istiftā, addendum to *Haqīqat-ul-Wahī*, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.22 p.660)

Qādiyānī. (Nevertheless, Rasūlullāh ﷺ not objecting to it is a clear proof to the correctness of this belief.)

Thirdly: The belief of the descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ cannot be an *Ijtihādī* mistake because Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has accepted, ‘We have not stated in this book any claim and proof from our own understanding.’ⁱ

Review the text,

‘Thirdly, this matter is clear to every person...(We) have only written the claim of the praised book and we have only written the proof that the pure book has indicated towards. We have not written any proof from own our understanding, nor any claim.’ⁱⁱ

The gist of the matter is that the above admission of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī remains intact and it is not only useless to try to attribute it to a different meaning or classify it as incorrect, in fact it is impossible.

Fourthly: Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī makes the claim himself that he is free from mistakes (*ma’sūm ‘anil khatā*). He writes,

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَتْرُكُنِي عَلَىٰ خَطَايَا طَرَفَةِ عَيْنٍ وَيُعْصِمُنِي عَنْ كُلِّ مِثْنٍ

ⁱ Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah vol.2, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.1 p.188

ⁱⁱ Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah vol.2, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.1 p.88

*Allāh ﷻ does not leave me for a moment on a mistake and
He protects me from every incorrect thing.ⁱ*

According to this claim, whatever Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has written in *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* is correct, otherwise this claim would be incorrect and a black lie.

Fifthly: Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī says that every saying of his is based on inspiration (*Ilhāmāt*). (Accordingly, he has written in his book,)

كلما قلت قلت من امره فعلت شيئاً من أمري

*Whatever I have said, I have said it from the command of
Allāh ﷻ. I have said nothing from my side.ⁱⁱ*

According to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, he was inspired (*mulham*) at the time when he was writing *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah*. According to him, an inspired (*mulham*) person cannot make an error. Therefore, how can his statement in *I'jāz-Ahmadī* be accepted, which is that he wrote incorrectly in *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah*?

We come to know from here that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī did not base the belief on 'the demise of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ' upon the Noble Qur'ān and Ahādīth. He based it on his inspiration (*Ilhām*). He

ⁱ Nūr-ul-Haq vol.2 p.72

ⁱⁱ Mawāhib-ur-Rahmān p.3, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.19 p.221

repeatedly makes this clarification.

Sixthly: Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī states a dream regarding *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah*. He writes,

‘Close to the time when this weak one was still studying during the first part of his life, he saw the last of the *Ambiyā*’ (ﷺ) in a dream. At that time, there was a *Dīnī* book in the hand of this weak one, which he had written.

Rasūlullāh (ﷺ) saw the book and asked in Arabic, ‘What name have you kept for this book?’ I said, ‘I have named it *Qutbī*.’ The interpretation of this name is that it is a book that is unshakable and it is firm like the *Qutb* (Polar) star. The firmness of the book was presented with a notification of ten thousand (10 000) Rupees. Rasūlullāh (ﷺ) took the book from me. When the book came into the hands of Rasūlullāh (ﷺ), it turned into a beautiful fruit, which was similar to a guava. However, it was the size of a watermelon. When Rasūlullāh (ﷺ) intended to cut it into pieces to distribute it, then a large amount of honey came out from it, which filled the hands of Rasūlullāh (ﷺ) until the elbow.ⁱ

ANALYSIS

The following conclusions come to the fore from this

ⁱ Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah p.249, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.1 p.275

dream:

1. According to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, Rasūlullāh ﷺ expressed happiness on the composition of *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* and he (ﷺ) classified it as authentic.

When according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, he wrote the belief on the life of Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ incorrectly in *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* then why did Rasūlullāh ﷺ not point out the error made?

Rasūlullāh ﷺ not objecting to the belief is a clear proof that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has written correctly the belief on the ascension and descent of Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ. His latter claim of the belief being incorrect, which he based on his inspiration (*Ilhāmāt*) is principally incorrect.

2. Rasūlullāh ﷺ was informed that the name of the book is *Qutbī*, the interpretation of which is that it is firm and unshakable like the *Qutb* (Polar) star. Now, if this belief is termed as incorrect and a belief of polytheism, then the book would no longer remain *Qutbī*. In fact, it would become infirm and shakeable.
3. Then a notification with a prize of of ten thousand (10 000) Rupees was offered due to its

firmness.

4. The book became a beautiful fruit, a guava similar to a watermelon, when the hands of Rasūlullāh ﷺ fell on it. A large amount of honey came out from it when Rasūlullāh ﷺ began to cut it, which filled his blessed hand until the elbow. When according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī a belief of polytheism, i.e. Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ being alive, was stated in the book, then together with the honey some excreta should have also come out (from the fruit), because according Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī polytheism (*Shirk*) is excreta in comparison to *Tawhīd*. The pure honey coming out (from the fruit) is an indication that this belief is not a belief of polytheism. In fact, it is a correct belief.

Seventhly: Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has clearly written that a person who receives inspiration from Allāh ﷻ (*mulham min-Allāh*) cannot make a mistake. Granted that he makes a mistake, then Allāh ﷻ informs him (about it). Review some of the texts of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī:

1. ‘If any mistake occurs, then the mercy of Allāh ﷻ quickly makes amends for them (the inspired

persons).ⁱ

2. والله يعلم أنني ما قلت الا ما قال الله تعالى و لم أقل كلمة قط يخالفه، و
ما مسها قلومي في عمري.

*Allāh ﷻ knows that I say whatever He says and
never did I say a word that is against Allāh ﷻ.
Never did my pen write anything against Allāh ﷻ.*ⁱⁱ

3. و من تفوه بكلمة ليس أصل صحيح في الشرع ملها كان أو مجتهدا
فبه الشياطين متلاعبا

*The person who says something for which there is no
authentic basis in shari'ah, irrespective of whether he is an
inspired person (Mulham) or a jurist (Mujtahid), the
devil (Shaytān) is playing with him.*

Now the Qādiyānīs should say that the belief on the descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ which Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī stated in *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* and similarly the belief on *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* which he clearly stated in his earlier books, if the basis for them is not found in the *sharī'ah*, then did the *Shayātīn* not play with him, irrespective of whether

ⁱ Footnotes of *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* p.448, *Rūhānī Khazā'in* vol.1 p.536 (Footnotes of the first chapter).

ⁱⁱ *Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā* p.10, *Rūhānī Khazā'in* vol.7 p.186

he is an inspired (*mulham*) person or a jurist (*muftahid*)? Is there any regard for the words of a person with whom the *Shayātīn* play? The *Shayātīn* happily also send revelation (*wahī*) to their friends.

THIRD PROOF

This belief is stated in a book that was written with the intention of reforming (people) and reviving *Dīn*. It was written at a time when Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī through his own thoughts had become an inspired person (*mulham*), a reformer (*Mujaddid*) and one who is commanded from the side of Allāh ﷻ, so much so that a notification of ten thousand (10 000) rupees was given on the book. Check the preface of *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah*ⁱ.

Whilst defining a reformer (*Mujaddid*), Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has stated, ‘He is taught by *Rūh-ul-Qudus* in difficult times’ⁱⁱ and ‘he is bestowed with inspired knowledge (*‘Ulūm Ladunniyyah*) and heavenly signs (*Āyāt Samāwiyyah*)’ⁱⁱⁱ. Therefore, the question of superficial beliefs and incorrect points being written in this book does not arise.

ⁱ Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah vol.1, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.1 p.24

ⁱⁱ Fath-Islam footnotes on Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.3 p.7

ⁱⁱⁱ Izālālat-ul-Awhām, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.3 p.179

FOURTH PROOF

﴿وَمَكُرُوا وَمَكَرَ اللَّهُ وَاللَّهُ خَيْرُ الْمَكِرِينَ﴾ آل عمران: ٥٤

And the disbelievers planned, but Allāh planned. And Allāh is the best of planners

METHOD OF EXTRAPOLATION

The Jews plotted to assassinate Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ. They conspired to kill him. Allāh ﷻ made mention of this conspiracy of theirs with the words وَمَكُرُوا. Allāh ﷻ mentioned His plan in opposition to theirs and He termed it as being better. The plot of the Jews failed and the plan of Allāh ﷻ triumphed. Accordingly, Yahūdā who was from amongst the *Hawārī* of Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ, he entered the house to catch Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ. Allāh ﷻ changed him into the form of Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ and raised Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ alive to the heavens through His power. This is the commentary that almost all reputable commentators have made. No commentary that is contrary to it can be presented, because whenever the plot of the Jews, i.e. the conspiracy to kill, will be in confrontation to the plan of Allāh ﷻ, then certainly the result would be that the assassination and death did not occur. This would only be through the ascension. When the ascension becomes established then the descent is proven automatically.

QĀDIYĀNĪ PLOT

Contrary to this, the plan of Allāh ﷻ which Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī stated is,

‘After this, Plutus called for a sitting for the final decision. He explained very much to the wicked scholars and jurists that they should refrain from spilling the blood of *Masīh*. However, they did not refrain. In fact, they screamed and said, certainly he should be put on the cross. He has turned away from the religion. Then Plutus asked for water and washed his hands, (and he said,) ‘See, I wash my hands from his blood’. All the Jews, jurists and scholars said, ‘His blood is on us and on our children.’

Then *Masīh* was handed over to them. Everyone saw that he was flogged, sworn at, slapped on the face at the instructions of the jurists and scholars and he was mocked at. Finally, they got ready to put him on the cross. It was the day of Friday and the time of ‘Asr. Coincidentally, it was also a day of festivity for the Jews. Therefore, they had very little free time. The Jews quickly put *Masīh* on the cross with two thieves so that the bodies could be brought down before the evening.’ⁱ

We come to know from the text of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī that according to him the plan of

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām p.379-381, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.3 p.395-396

Allāh ﷻ with regards to Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ was,

1. He was flogged.
2. He was sworn at.
3. He was slapped on the face.
4. He was mocked at.
5. He was put on the cross.

This mockery of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī with the Noble Qur’ān and the promise of Allāh ﷻ equates to open Kufr. Any further distortion of the Noble Qur’ān is not possible. None of the commentators from the past fourteen centuries is in conformity with the Mirzā’is and neither has anyone written this commentary.

هاتوا برهانكم ان كنتم صادقين

FIFTH PROOF

﴿إِذْ قَالَ اللَّهُ يَٰعِيسَىٰ إِنِّي مُتَوَفِّيكَ وَرَافِعُكَ إِلَيَّ وَمُطَهِّرُكَ مِنَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا وَجَاعِلُ الَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوكَ فَوْقَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا إِلَىٰ يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ ثُمَّ إِلَيَّ مَرْجِعُكُمْ فَأَحْكُمُ بَيْنَكُمْ فِيمَا كُنتُمْ فِيهِ تَخْتَلِفُونَ﴾ آل عمران: ٥٥

[Mention] when Allāh said, "O ‘Īsā, indeed I will give you death and raise you to Myself and purify you from those who disbelieve and make those who follow you [in submission to Allāh alone] superior to those who disbelieve until the

Day of Resurrection. Then to Me is your return, and I will judge between you concerning that in which you used to differ.

This verse is also a clear proof that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is living and he ascended (to the heavens) with his body. In this verse, Allāh ﷻ made four (4) promises to Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ in opposition to the plot of the Jews:

1. I will grant you death, i.e. the Jews will not be able to kill you.
2. I will raise you now towards Myself.
3. I will purify you from the disbelievers, i.e. the Jews.
4. I will grant your followers triumph over your enemies until *Qiyāmah*.

It is apparent that these four (4) promises were made at the time when the Jews had already made the plan to assassinate Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. According to all the commentators (*Mufasssirīn*) and reformers (*Mujaddidīn*) the word رافعك إلى here refers to the bodily ascension. In (the past) thirteen centuries, there is not a single commentator who has stated that the ‘ascension’ refers to raising of stages or spiritual ascension. Certainly, the commentators and scholars hold two views regarding the meaning of (the word) متوفيك:

1. Most scholars have stated that the meaning of توفي is to take fully, i.e. to take the body and soul.
2. Some scholars have stated that توفي refers to death, i.e. I will give you death. This meaning is also not contrary to our deduction, because the scholars who state that توفي means مميت, they are of the view that there is *Taqdīm* and *Ta'khīr* in the verse (i.e. the sequence in the verse is different from the sequence in reality), i.e. [I will grant you death on your appointed time and I will raise you now (Tafsīr Ibn-‘Abbās)]. The reason is that (*wāw*) is used for *Mutlaq Jam'* (i.e. to simply join two words). There is no regard for sequence in it. In this verse, the conjunction has occurred with a (*wāw*). Therefore, it is not necessary to be sequential.

IRRITATION OF MIRZĀ QĀDIYĀNĪ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī adopted the second meaning of متوفيك. However, when we stated that the (*wāw*) is for *Mutlaq Jam'*, then it caused all the ill effects of this meaning to go into vain. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī became greatly irritated when this point came to the fore. He said in a rage of anger,

‘It is not the work of a Muslim to turn around the sequence of the Noble Qur’ān. Did Allāh ﷻ not know

this? He would have stated the correct sequence. O Muslim Maulwīs, do you not shy from making changes in the speech of Allāh.ⁱ

Answer 1:

All the scholars of syntax are unanimous that , does not come to show sequence. In fact, it comes for *Mutlaq Jam'*, contrary to *thumma* and *fā*. It is an act of ignorance to establish sequence through *wāw*.

Answer 2:

There are a number of examples in the Noble Qur'ān wherein *wāw* is used to merely join two words, for example,

﴿وَأَسْجُدِي وَارْكَعِي﴾ آل عمران: ٤٣

and,

﴿فَأَخَذَهُ اللَّهُ نَكَالَ الْآخِرَةِ وَالْأُولَى﴾ النازعات: ٢٥

It is apparent that *Sajdah* takes place after and *Rukū'* is done first, whilst in the first verse *Sajdah* is stated first. Similarly, the hereafter is to come later on and the world comes before it. However, in the second verse the hereafter is stated first, before the world.

ⁱ Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.3 p.422

Answer 3:

A number of commentators have stated the commentary by turning around the sequence of متوفيك و رافعك, just as it passed in the commentary of Sayyidunā ‘Abdullāh Ibn ‘Abbās ؓ.

Answer 4:

Granted that there is sequence in this verse as is the view of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, then too his claim does not become established, because even according Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī the sequence does not remain in the four promises. This is because according to the commentary of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī the translation would be,

‘O ‘Isā, I will first give you death. Then I will spiritually elevate you or elevate your status. Then I will purify you from the non-believers. Then I will grant triumph to your followers over your enemies.’

According to the view of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, Sayyidunā ‘Isā ؑ passed away after he migrated towards Kashmir to purify himself (from the non-believers), i.e. eighty-seven (87) years after the incident of the cross. It is as though مطهرک من الذین کفروا (migration towards Kashmir) occurred first and his death and elevation occurred afterwards, whilst the reality is that it (مطهرک من الذین کفروا) is on the third place in

the sequence of the verse. Therefore, even according to the Mirzā'is the verse does not remain on its sequence. Therefore, the objection levelled against us of not following the sequence is futile.

Answer 5:

Granted that we take the meaning of متوفيك that the Mirzā'is give, then too it is not very useful for their objective, i.e. to establish the death (of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ). The reasons being that it could be possible that the death occurs after his descent to the earth, the news of which Allāh ﷻ gave to Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ earlier. As it agreed upon by the scholars that , does not come for sequence, therefore it is not necessary for it (متوفيك) to appear before و رافعك الي. Even if it is taken that the wāw is for sequence, then too the claim of the Mirzā'is, (i.e.) negation of the ascension, cannot be established, because it is not possible that death was given to Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ for a short period before the ascension to the heavens and then he was given life and raised to the heavens, just as it is the opinion of some of the pious predecessors like Wahb Ibn Munabbih ⁱ.

REASON FOR THE SEQUENCE OF THE VERSES

The original and researched answer for the sequence in

ⁱ Abridgement of Al-Khitab-ul-Malīh Fī Tahqīq-il-Mahdī Wal-Masīh

words not being found (in the verse) is that the Christians and Jews have gone to extremes with regards Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ. If on the one hand the Christians raised him to the stage of being a deity, then (on the other hand) the Jews did not even accept his *Risālat* and they (tried to) humiliate him. In this verse, the Noble Qur’ān wants to refute the beliefs of both groups. متوفيك was brought first so that the Christians could ponder that how could a being upon whom death will come be a deity? Immediately thereafter و رافعك إلى was brought to show that the disrespect shown to him by the Jews is sheer oppression. Allāh ﷻ called him to Himself due to his *Risālat*. This is an open proof to his acceptance by Allāh ﷻ. Therefore, the Christians should leave out the belief that he is a deity and the Jews should leave out the belief that he is of a lower rank. They should leave out extremism and adopt the path of moderation. Since polytheism is a greater sin than disrespect to a Rasūl, therefore it was also considered in the refutation and متوفيك was brought first.

SECOND REASON

It was important to make the plot of the Jews to kill Sayyidunā ‘Isā ﷺ fail and to protect him from their programme. Therefore, it was mentioned first, i.e. consolation was given.

RESEARCH OF THE WORD 'TAWAFFĀ'

The root (word) of this word is *وفاء*. When the root word is transferred to *Bāb Tafā'ul*, then the true meaning would be 'to take fully', for example; *أَتُوفِيتَ الثَّمَنَ* (Did you take the full amount of money?) Certainly, when an indication is present, then this word is also used in the meaning of death and sleep, as in the command of Allāh ﷻ,

﴿وَهُوَ الَّذِي يَتَوَفَّاكُم بِاللَّيْلِ﴾ الأنعام: ٦٠

And it is He who takes your souls by night

Similarly, the command of Allāh ﷻ,

﴿اللَّهُ يَتَوَفَّى الْأَنفُسَ حِينَ مَوْتِهَا وَالَّتِي لَمْ تَمُتْ فِي مَنَامِهَا﴾ الزمر: ٤٢

Allāh takes the souls at the time of their death, and those that do not die during their sleep.

This verse is a clear proof that the meaning of (*Tawaffā*) is not only 'death'. In fact the meaning is to 'take fully'. It is for this reason that it is correct to use it for 'death' and 'sleep'. If it was only in the meaning of death, then it would not be correct to use (*Tawaffā*) for sleep, whilst the reality is that in the verse the word (*Tawaffā*) has been used for both (death and sleep). It is this meaning of (*Tawaffā*) that is recorded in the reliable commentaries. The interesting part is that the citations (for this meaning) have been recorded in the reliable book of the

Qādiyānīs, ‘Asl-Musaffā.

See,

First Citation:

متوفيك و رافعك إلي - على التقديم و التأخير و قد يكون الوفاة قبضا ليس
بموتⁱ

Second Citation:

فلما توفيتني الخ: التوفى أخذ الشيء و افيا و الموت نوع منهⁱⁱ

Third Citation:

يستعمل التوفى في أخذ الشى و افيا اي كاملا و الموت نوع منهⁱⁱⁱ

THE CHALLENGE OF MIRZĀ QĀDIYĀNĪ

Since the stated meaning of (*Tawaffā*) is dynamite for the falsehood of the Mirzā’is, therefore in order to preserve his honour and instil his awe in the people Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī published a powerful challenge,

‘(*Tawaffā*) is from *Bāb Tafā’ul*. Allāh ﷻ is the *Fā’il*. *Dhī*

ⁱ Majma-ul-Bihār vol.2 p.454, quoted from ‘Asl-Musaffā vol.1 p.175

ⁱⁱ Tafsīr Sāfi, quoted from Asl-Musaffā vol.1 p.263

ⁱⁱⁱ Hāshiyah Sāwī ‘Alāl Jalālayn vol.1 p.315, ‘Asl-Musaffā vol.1 p.263

Rūh is the *Maf'ūl*. Even if there is no indication of 'night' or 'sleep', then too the meaning of '*Qabdh Rūh*' will be death. Whoever can prove otherwise, he will receive a prize of one thousand (1000) Rupees.'

The text of the challenge is,

1. 'This rule is accepted in syntax that in the word (*Tawaffā*) when 'Allāh ﷻ is the *Fā'il* and a human is the *Maf'ūl Bibī*, (then) in such an instance the meaning of (*Tawaffā*) will always be 'to give death' and 'extract the soul'.ⁱ
2. 'It is stated in all the books of grammar that when 'Allāh ﷻ is the *Fā'il* and a human being is the *Maf'ūl Bibī*, then no meaning other than 'extracting the soul' and 'giving death' will be taken.'ⁱⁱ
3. 'In the places where there is difference of opinion (the word) *Tawaffā* appears from the *Bāb Tafa'ul*, Allāh ﷻ is the *Fā'il* and *Dhī Rūh*, i.e. Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ, is the *Maf'ūl*. It is for this reason that the promised Messiah said that he would give a prize of one thousand (1000) Rupees to the person who would show a meaning other than

ⁱ Tuhfah Golrawiyyah, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.17 p.162

ⁱⁱ Ayyām As-Sulh, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.14 p.384

‘extracting the soul’ for (the word) *Tawaffā*. However, to this day there has been no warrior of the field who would obtain this prize, neither will there be any such person.’ⁱ

4. ‘If any person can prove from the Noble Qur’ān or Hadīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ or from ancient and new poetry or prose that the word (*Tawaffā*) when it appears in the condition that Allāh ﷻ is the *Fā’il* and it is attributed towards a *Dhawir-Rūb*, then it also comes in a meaning other than ‘extracting the soul’ and ‘giving death’, then I take a promise by Allāh ﷻ that I will sell a portion of my belongings and give that person the sum of one thousand (1000) Rupees in cash.’ⁱⁱ

RESPONSE

1. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made up this rule. This rule is not narrated from any scholar of syntax or any linguist. If any Mirzā’ī can show this rule from any book of syntax or language, then we will award him a prize of ten thousand (10 000) Rupees.ⁱⁱⁱ

ⁱ Ahmadiyyah pocket book p.341

ⁱⁱ *Izālah Awhām, Rūhānī Khazā’* in vol.3 p.603

ⁱⁱⁱ *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah, Rūhānī Khazā’* in vol.1 p.620

2. This made up rule of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is broken through his own writings, for example; it is stated in *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* that the meaning of متوفيك is 'I will give you complete bounty'. Similarly, the following text of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī,

'The inspiration of *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah*, i.e. يا عيسى إني متوفيك, that is published from seventeen (17) years ago, the meaning of it fully opened at that time, i.e. this inspiration was made to Sayyidūnā 'Īsā ﷺ as consolation when the Jews were making efforts to crucify him. In this place, the Hindus are making effort instead of the Jews. The meaning of *Ilhām* is that I will save you from such a disgraced and accursed death.'

3. This made up rule of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is completely crushed through the Hadīth,

عن ابن عمر وإذا رمى الجمار لا يدري أحد ما له حتى يتوفاه
الله يوم القيامة (رواه البزار والطبراني وابن حبان واللفظ له)ⁱⁱ

All the conditions stated by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī are found in the above Hadīth.

ⁱ Sirāj Mūnīr, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.12 p.23 on the footnotes

ⁱⁱ At-Targhīb Wat-Tarhīb vol.2 p.205

However, no foolish person can also translate it
(يتوفاه) with death here.

CHALLENGE TO THE QĀDIYANĪS

We make an open challenge to the Mirzā'īs that they should prove the rule stated by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī from any book of syntax. They will receive a prize of their wish. It is the ignorance and foolishness of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī for making this rule into a rule of syntax. The poor man does not even know the science of syntax. A student of the first grade of Arabic studies also knows that this rule could be a rule of the science of literature, but it cannot be a rule of the science of syntax. Then too, we broke his made up rule and they cannot break our rule until *Qiyāmah*.

فالحمد لله

All praise is for Allāh

OUR CHALLENGE

It is our claim that when the word *wafā* appears in the *Bāb Tafa'ul*, and Allāh ﷻ is the *Fā'il* and such a human is the *Maf'ul* who was born without a father, then (*Tawaffā*) does not appear in the meaning of 'death' anywhere. In fact, the meaning will be 'to be raised to the heavens alive'. The Mirzā'īs can prove contrary to this and receive a prize of their wish. However, *Inshā*

Allāh they will not have the courage to break this rule until *Qiyāmah*. If any person asks for a citation for this rule, then it should be said without any hesitation that it appears in the same book of syntax where the made up rule of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is stated, on the previous page.

SIXTH PROOF

Allāh ﷻ says in the Noble Qur’ān,

﴿وَمَا قَتَلُوهُ يَقِينًا ۖ بَلْ رَفَعَهُ اللَّهُ إِلَيْهِ﴾ النساء: ١٥٧ - ١٥٨

And they did not kill him, for certain

Rather, Allāh raised him to Himself

Hakīm Nur-ud-Dīn (the first *Khalīfah*) has also made the same translation of this verse, ‘In fact, Allāh ﷻ raised him towards Himself.’ⁱ

This verse also holds great importance in relation to the affirmation on the ascension of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ.

A point should be kept in mind that here that the Jews did not assassinate Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. It is a false claim of theirs. It is for this reason when the Noble Qur’ān enumerated the evils of the Jews, it did not say *و قتلهم المسيح*. In fact, it said *و قتلهم إنا قتلنا الخ*. This point could be

ⁱ Fasl-ul-Khitāb p.314 on the footnotes

classified as a separate proof for the affirmation for the ascension of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ. In this perspective, the meaning of بل رفعه الله إليه becomes absolute, that it is the bodily ascension. Certainly there remains no room for any interpretation.

It is our challenge that if the Mirzā'īs are true, then they should quote a single commentator from the commentators of (the past) thirteen centuries who has explained a meaning contrary to ours, in accordance with the made up meaning of the Qādiyānīs.

FEEBLE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE MIRZĀ'ĪS OF THE VERSES

FIRST EXCUSE

Generally the first answer of the Mirzā'īs with regards to this clear verse is that the ascension here does not refer to a bodily ascension. In fact it refers to the raising of status and a spiritual ascension, because according to the Jews a death on the cross is an accursed death. Therefore, Allāh ﷻ said in reply to the Jews that they could not disgrace him. In fact, We raised his status.

This interpretation of the Mirzā'īs is refuted in the following ways:

Answer 1:

This claim is completely incorrect and without any proof. We can say with complete confidence that in (the past) thirteen (13) centuries there is not a single commentator or *Muhaddith* or linguist who took the meaning of spiritual ascension here. In fact, all of them have unanimously taken the meaning of ascension to the heavens with the body. Therefore, according to the criterion set out by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, the meaning of spiritual ascension would be incorrect. They cannot present the affirmation of a single commentator from the (past) thirteen (13) centuries.

Answer 2:

The assumption that according to the Jews a death on the cross is (an) accursed (death) is complete nonsense. Firstly, because it is based on the Bible, which has been distorted. Secondly, because the Jews have assassinated a number of *Ambiyā'* according to their habit, as mentioned in the Noble Qur'ān,

﴿وَيَقْتُلُونَ الْأَنْبِيَاءَ بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ﴾ آل عمران: ١١٢

And they killed the Ambiyā' without right

Therefore, apparently the *Ambiyā'* ﷺ were assassinated on the cross. In opposing this, why did Allāh ﷻ then not use the word رفع (ascension) for those *Ambiyā'* ﷺ, whilst the reality is that is that their assassination raised

their status and it was a spiritual ascension. In the matter of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ when the assassination did not take place, the Jews have just said that he was assassinated, then too the word رَفَعَ (ascension) was used. Therefore, we come to know that a spiritual ascension cannot be meant (here). The only intended meaning here is an ascension with the body.

SECOND OBJECTION OF THE MIRZĀ’IS

The Mirzā’is say that how can Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ go the heavens when he is a human. There are a number of fire balls between the heavens and earth. A human does not have the power to pass them. It is for this reason that when the polytheists of Makkah demanded from Rasūlullāh ﷺ that he should go to the heavens, he ﷺ said,

﴿هَلْ كُنْتُ إِلَّا بَشَرًا رَسُولًا﴾ الإسراء: ٩٣

Was I ever but a human messenger?

We come to know (from here) that a human cannot do this.

SILENCING RESPONSE

We can tear this weak excuse into shreds in two ways. Firstly, through a counter question and secondly through a researched reply. The counter question is not

just a response, in fact it is an atom bomb that will not only uproot this excuse, but it will uproot the entire belief of the Mirzā'is with regards to the 'death' of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ. This answer will be of use in many places. Place your hand on the heart and review it,

'Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ passed through the fire balls and went to the heavens in the same manner that Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ went. Just as Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ is alive, in the same way Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ is alive.'

This is no invention of ours. In fact, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has written,

First Citation:

بل حياة كلیم الله ثابت بنص القرآن الكريم ألا تقرء في القرآن ما قال الله تعالى
عز و جل فلا تكن في مریة من لقاءه؟ و أنت تعلم أن هذه الآية نزلت في
موسى فهی دلیل صریح على حياة موسى عليه السلام لأنه لقي رسول الله
صلی الله علیه و سلم و الأموات لا یلاقون الأحياء و لا تجد مثل هذه الآيات
في شان عيسى عليه السلام نعم جاء ذكر وفاته في مقامات شتى¹

Second Citation:

هذا هو موسى فتى الله الذي أشار في كتابه إلى حياته و فرض علينا أن نؤمن
بأنه حي في السماء و لم يمت و ليس من الميتين

¹ Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.7 p.221

This is Mūsā, the man of Allāh, regarding whom there is an indication in the Noble Qur’ān that he is alive. It has become compulsory upon us to believe that he is alive in the heavens. He is not from amongst the dead.ⁱ

EFFORT WITHOUT RESULT

Generally the Mirzā’is try to save their lives by also attributing this ascension of Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ to a spiritual ascension. However, it is not that easy to save one’s life.

The researched answer to this interpretation is:

In the above citation, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself has made a comparison between Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ and Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ, that Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ is alive and Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ has passed away. This comparison can only be correct when the ascension refers to a bodily ascension, and the physical (bodily) death of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ (is meant) and the physical (bodily) life of Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ is meant. This is the view of the Qādiyānīs.

The Qādiyānīs interpret the text حي في السماء as spiritual life and (they interpret) لم يمت that appears after (it) as negation to a spiritual death. This interpretation is invalid due to a number of reasons.

ⁱ Nūr-ul-Haq, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.8 p.69

Firstly, no person holds the view that a spiritual death occurred to Sayyidunā Mūsā عليه السلام, that it be necessary to prove his spiritual life.

Secondly, a few lines after the quoted text of Nūr-ul-Haq, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has made a comparison between Sayyidunā Mūsā عليه السلام and Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام,

ولا تجد مثل هذه الآيات في شأن عيسى

If this comparison is accepted and the interpretation of the Mirzā’is is also accepted, then from this text one would have to admit to the spiritual death of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام, which is *Kufr*. Therefore, bodily life is meant in both places.

Researched Answer 1:

The answer to the stated objection and excuse is that the matter here is not about going by oneself. In fact, it is about being taken from the side of Allāh ﷻ. Can any person make this claim, may Allāh ﷻ protect us, that Allāh ﷻ also does not have the power to take someone to the heavens. When Rasūlullāh ﷺ said that he cannot fulfil the demand due to being a human, it was a negation of not (being able) to go by himself, it was not a negation from Allāh ﷻ (being able) to take him. Accordingly, during *Mi’rāj*, Rasūlullāh ﷺ was taken to the heavens from the side of Allāh ﷻ, not that he went

from his own side.

Answer 2:

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself admits that it is not impossible to go to the heavens with the body. In fact, it is possible. Take a look at the text of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī,

‘This answer is sufficient for us that firstly it is not farfetched from the power of Allāh ﷻ for a human to go with his body to the heavens.’ⁱ

Answer 3:

There is astonishment on the Mirzā’s that it is acceptable to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī that the robe of Babā Guru Nanak comes down from the heavens and the fire does not burn it, but the *Zamharīr* ball or fire ball is an obstacle for Sayyidunā Īsā ﷺ to ascend or descend. Check *Rūhānī Khazā’in*ⁱⁱ,

‘Some people will express astonishment that this robe came down from the heavens and Allāh ﷻ wrote it with his hands. However, when one looks at the unlimited powers of Allāh ﷻ, (then) there is no astonishment, because no one has restricted His powers.’

ⁱ Chashmā Marifat p.219, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.23 p.228

ⁱⁱ Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.10 p.157

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself accepts the ascension and descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ from the bible,

‘From amongst the testimonies of the bible that we received is the following verse of the bible of Matthew, ‘And then shall appear the sign of the son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.’ⁱ Check Matthew chapter 24 verse 30.’ⁱⁱ

In short, the Noble Qur’ān, Hadīth and Bible, all agree that Masīh ﷺ is alive, the physical (bodily) descent (will occur) and the physical (bodily) ascension had occurred. Therefore, now there remains no need to present any verse, Hadīth or proof from the Bible.

Answer 4:

Allāh ﷻ took Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ to the heavens with his physical body. The fire ball did not act as an obstacle. Allāh ﷻ made the fire ball cool, just as he had made it cool for Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ and Sayyidah Hawwā’ ﷺ when they were sent from Jannah to the world. Just as Allāh ﷻ made the fire cool for Sayyidunā Ibrāhīm ﷺ,

ⁱ Masīh Hindustān Me, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.15 p.38

ⁱⁱ Masīh Hindustān Me, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.15 p.38

in the same way he made the fire ball cool for Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself makes this admission. He writes,

1. ‘Since Sayyidunā Ibrāhīm ﷺ was a true and loyal servant of Allāh ﷻ, therefore Allah ﷻ helped him in all testing times. When he was oppressively thrown into the fire, Allāh ﷻ made the fire cool for him.’ⁱ

اسی کا تھا معجزانہ اثر کہ ناک پچا جس سے وقت خطر 2.

بچا آگ سے اور بچا آب سے اسی کے اثر سے نہ اسباب سےⁱⁱ

SUMMARY

Sometimes Allāh ﷻ does certain things that are contrary to the general rules. This is special to Allāh ﷻ. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī also accepts this. If the examples presented by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī are correct, then despite the fire ball being present, it is possible, contrary to the general rules, that Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ descends (to the world), and Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ ascends (to the heavens) and descends (to the world). If the Qādiyānīs want to persist in saying that how was it possible for Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ to pass through the fire

ⁱ Haqīqat-ul-Wahī, Rūhānī Khazā’ in p.52

ⁱⁱ Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.10 p.162

ball, then they should first make this announcement that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has spoken lies one after the other in the citations provided.

THIRD OBJECTION OF THE MIRZĀ'IS

The Mirzā'is say regarding the verse بل رفعه الله that it is incorrect to classify (the بل) as بل ابطالية, because the scholars of syntax have clearly stated that a بل ابطالية cannot appear in the speech of Allāh ﷻ. The reason being that it would mean that there is a contradiction in the speech of Allāh ﷻ, which is impossible.

Answer:

The answer to the objection is that the Mirzā'is have acted in a deceptive manner in quoting this rule. The reason being that the scholars of syntax who have stated this rule, they have also made a clarification that when Allāh ﷻ quotes the statements of the non-believers, then a بل ابطالية can appear in refutation of it. The author of the Mirzā'ī pocket bookⁱ has also admitted this point. بل ابطالية appears in a number of places in the Noble Qur'ān,

﴿وَقَالُوا اتَّخَذَ اللَّهُ وَلَدًا سُبْحَنَهُ ۖ بَلْ لَهُ مَا فِي السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالْاَرْضِ كُلُّ لَهٗ رَقِیۡتُوۡنَ ۚ﴾
البقرة: ١١٦

ⁱ Ahmadiyyah Pocket Book p.373

﴿وَقَالُوا اتَّخَذَ الرَّحْمَنُ وَلَدًا سُبْحَنَهُ بَلْ عِبَادٌ مُّكْرَمُونَ﴾ الأنبياء: ٢٦
 ﴿أَمْ يَقُولُونَ افْتَرَاهُ بَلْ هُوَ الْحَقُّ مِنْ رَبِّكَ﴾ السجدة: ٣

ANOTHER INTERPRETATION

The Mirzā'is say that in رفعه, the difference in the antecedent (*Marjā'*) of the personal pronoun (*Dhamīr*) is from the category of *San'at-Istikhdām*. The answer to this is that here *San'at-Istikhdām* is only possible when 'Īsā Ibn Maryam has two meanings. No one holds this view (that 'Īsā Ibn Maryam has two meanings). Classifying it as *San'at-Istikhdām* is a clear proof to the ignorance of the Mirzā'is.

DEFINITION OF 'ISTIKHDĀM'

It is when a word has two meanings and one (of the two) meanings is intended when the word is spoken. When the personal pronoun (*Dhamīr*) refers back to the word, then the second meaning is intended.ⁱ

إذا نزل السماء بأرض قوم

رعيناه وإن كانوا خضابا

سما means rain. The second meaning towards which the personal pronoun (*Dhamīr*) of رعيناه refers back to, is vegetation, which grew from the rain.

ⁱ From Talkhīs-ul-Miftāh p.71

ANOTHER IMPORTANT POINT

It should be remembered that a sentence in which بل ابطالية is used, (then in such a sentence) there will be disagreement between the subject matter that appears before and after بل, otherwise there will be no benefit of the بل ابطالية. It is for this reason that in the verse under discussion, if a spiritual ascension is meant, then there would be no disagreement (between what appears after بل) and what appears before (بل). (Here) the disagreement (between the subject matter before and after بل) is only possible when the ‘ascension’ refers to a physical (bodily) ascension. The reason being that there is no disagreement between ‘raising of stages’ and ‘assassination’. (However) the disagreement between ‘physical ascension’ and ‘assassination’ is apparent. Therefore, it is certain that بل ابطالية is meant here. It serves as a support to our proof.

FOURTH MIRZĀ’Ī INTERPRETATION

The Mirzā’īs make a farfetched interpretation and say that the affirmation to the ascension can only be proven from the above verse when the personal pronoun of وما and رفعه, (when the personal pronoun of) both (words) refers back to only one condition of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ, (i.e. the condition of) body with soul. We do not accept this. In fact, it is our claim that that the antecedent for the personal pronoun of رفعه is the soul of

Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ only, not the body. The precedent for this is the verse of the Noble Qur’ān,

﴿ثُمَّ أَمَانَهُ وَأَقْبَرَهُ﴾ عبس: ٢١

It is agreed upon by all that (in the above verse) the first antecedent of the first personal pronoun is ‘the body with the soul’ and the antecedent of the second personal pronoun is ‘soul’ only or ‘body’ only.

Answer 1:

The Mirzā’is should not remain in vain hopes thinking that they struck a big arrow by making this objection. The reason being that the verse from which they made this deduction, that verse can never be a precedent for the verse under discussion. The reason being that once امانه was said, (then) certainly a separation occurred between the soul and body. Now the personal pronoun of اقبره cannot refer back to both (the soul and body). It will only refer back to one (of them). In the verse under discussion, وَمَا قَتَلُوهُ يَقِينًا ۖ بَلْ رَفَعَهُ اللَّهُ إِلَيْنَا, here the ascension is being affirmed to after a negation is made to the assassination. It is as though a clear negation is made to the separation of the body from the soul. Therefore, here the antecedent can only be ‘body with the soul’. It is incorrect to take one (body or soul) and leave the other.

Answer 2:

In the above verse, when a separation has occurred

between the body and soul after death, then it is certain that the antecedent of the second personal pronoun is either 'body' only or 'soul' only. Both (the body and soul) cannot be the antecedent. This is different from the verse under discussion, because here the personal pronoun appears with 'the ascension' after 'the assassination and cross' (i.e. after negation of death). Therefore, certainly here the ascension would be of the body with soul, not the (ascension of the) soul only. Therefore, a deductive reasoning on this verse would be a discriminative deductive reasoning (*Qiyās Ma'al-Fāriq*).

Answer 3:

In (the verse) اَمَاتَهُ فَاقْبِرْهُ the antecedent in both places is the 'body with the soul'. The different conditions of a human are being discussed in it (the verse), the human who is known in the mind (مَعْهُدٌ فِي الذَّهْنِ).

A spiritual ascension cannot be meant here because the singular masculine absent personal pronoun has come four times here. There is full agreement that the antecedent of three of these personal pronouns is '(Sayyidunā) 'Īsā Ibn Maryam (ﷺ) with his body and soul'. The antecedent of these (three) personal pronouns is not 'body' only, neither is it 'soul' only. The reason being that the act of assassination and (putting on the) cross can only come into play when the soul and

body is found together. Therefore, certainly the antecedent for the personal pronoun of ‘ascension’ would also be ‘body with the soul’ and not ‘soul’ only. The sentence *كان الله عزيزا حكيما* (which appears after) is also a strong proof for the ‘ascension’ being (a) physical (ascension), otherwise there was no need to mention these qualities if a ‘spiritual ascension’ took place’. (If a spiritual ascension is meant, then) it *(كان الله عزيزا حكيما)* would be an extra (unnecessary) sentence in the speech Allāh ﷻ, which is impossible. Every sentence of the Noble Qur’ān has a meaning to it.

FIFTH OBJECTION

In order to establish their belief and (try) to distort the meaning of the verse under discussion, the Mirzā’is present a proof - that it is stated in Hadīth,

إذا تواضع العبد رفعه الله إلى السماء السابعة

When a servant adopts humility, Allāh ﷻ raises him to the seventh heaven

According to everyone the ‘ascension’ here refers to raising of stages. The exact same words (*رفعه الله*) appear in the verse (of the Noble Qur’ān under discussion). Therefore, the only meaning intended there is ‘spiritual ascension’.

STRIKE THE KNEE AND EXPECT THE EYE TO

BURST

This deductive reasoning is a discriminative deductive reasoning (*Qiyās Ma'al-Fāriq*). The above proverb fully fits this proof of the Mirzā'īs. The reason being that in the Hadīth the word تواضع itself is an indication that a physical ascension is not intended (in the Hadīth). In the verse under discussion the assassination has been negated and the ascension has been affirmed. Therefore, the meaning (in the verse) will only be correct when a physical (bodily) ascension is meant. A 'spiritual ascension' can occur together with an 'assassination'. There would have been no need to mention it (the spiritual ascension) separately (from the 'assassination' if a 'spiritual ascension' was intended). Therefore, no deduction can be made from the meaning of the above stated Hadīth for the verse بل رفعه الله. The second point is that up to this day no commentator or reformer has taken the meaning of 'spiritual ascension' from the verse under discussion. In fact, all of them have affirmed the 'physical (bodily) ascension'.

CHALLENGE

We make a challenge to the Qādiyānīs again that they should present a single reliable commentator of the (past) thirteen centuries who took the meaning of 'spiritual ascension' in the verse under discussion. They will receive a prize of their wish. Is there any son of his

father who would come forward in the field?

FINAL ARROW OF THE QUIVER

After being unsuccessful in every front with regards to the verse بل رفعه, the Mirzā'is presented a refutation - that it is incorrect to take the meaning of 'heaven' from (the word) إليه. The reason being that Allāh ﷻ is present in every place. It is mentioned in the Noble Qur'ān,

﴿فَإَيْنَمَا تُولُوْا فَشَمَّ وَجْهُ ٱللّٰهِ﴾ البقرة: ١١٥

Wherever you turn, Allāh is there

Answer 1:

All the commentators have taken the meaning of 'heaven'. If anyone has written contrary to it, then present the proof.

Answer 2:

The real point is that Allāh ﷻ attributes 'highness' towards Himself. It is for this reason that it is mentioned (in the Noble Qur'ān),

﴿إِلَيْهِ يَصْعَدُ ٱلْكَلِمُ الطَّيِّبُ﴾ فاطر: ١٠

To Him ascends good speech

It is necessary that there be 'highness' for صعود (ascending) to take place. We come to know from other *shar'i* texts that the 'highness' is the heavens. Therefore,

in the verse under discussion it would be correct to take the meaning of 'heaven' from (the word) إليه.

Answer 3:

The Noble Qur'ān itself testifies that Allāh ﷻ is in the heavens. See,

﴿أَمْ نَمُنُّمْ فِي السَّمَاءِ أَنْ يَخْسِفَ بِكُمُ الْأَرْضُ فَإِذَا هِيَ تَمُورُ﴾ الملك: ١٦

Answer 4:

It is strange that the accusation made upon us is - that (the word) إليه cannot refer to the heavens, whilst no mention is made of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī who repeatedly committed this crime. We present three citations below, which prove that Allāh ﷻ is in the heavens and the ascension to the heavens occurred. See,

First Citation:

مظهر الحق و العلاء كأن الله نزل من السماءⁱ

We come to know (from here) that even according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, Allāh ﷻ is in the heavens.

Second Citation:

ألا يعلمون أن المسيح ينزل من السماء بجميع علومهⁱⁱ

ⁱ Tadhkirah p.185

ⁱⁱ Ā'īnah Kamālāt-Islām, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.5 p.409

Do the people not know that Masīh will descend from the heavens with all (his) knowledge

We come to know (from here that) Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ was first raised to the heavens. It is only then possible that he will descend from there.

Third Citation:

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes,

‘Every person is raised to the heavens according to his status and he takes a portion of elevation according to his proximity. The souls of the *Ambiyā’* and *Awliyā’*, although it is on the earth during their worldly lives, but then too it has a connection with that heaven which is stipulated as the boundary of ascension for that soul. After death the soul goes to stay in the heaven that has been stipulated as the boundary of ascension for it.’ⁱ

It is proven from here that إليه refers to the heavens. There is no difference (in view) regarding the boundary of ascension. In fact, the difference is in the thing that ascended. Did the soul only ascend or was the body also with it?

Note: There are four personal pronouns in this verse. There is agreement that the antecedent of three is ‘Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ alive’. Therefore, the antecedent of

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.3 p.276

the fourth personal pronoun will also be ‘Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ alive, body with the soul’. And بل also demands that a physical (bodily) ascension be intended, so that there remains a disagreement between that which appears before and that which appears after بل, the demand of which بل makes.

SEVENTH PROOF

The two qualities of Allāh ﷻ mentioned in و كان الله عزيزا حكيما are also a proof to the physical ascension. It is completely out of place to mention these two qualities for a ‘spiritual ascension’ or ‘raising of stages’. The reason being that the soul is a delicate thing. Its ascension is no impossible matter, for which there be any need to state that Allāh ﷻ is overpowering. In mentioning the quality حكيما, it is an answer to the doubt - that the other *Ambiyā’* ﷺ did not have a physical (bodily) ascension, why did Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ have a physical (bodily) ascension? The answer was given that Allāh ﷻ is All-Wise. No work of His is void of wisdom. A human can not reach unto every (matter of) wisdom of Allāh ﷻ.

EIGHTH PROOF

It is the command of Allāh ﷻ,

﴿وَإِنْ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ إِلَّا لِيُؤْمِنَنَّ بِهِ قَبْلَ مَوْتِهِ وَيَوْمَ الْقِيَمَةِ يَكُونُ عَلَيْهِمْ شَهِيدًا﴾

النساء: ١٥٩

And there is none from the People of the Scripture but that he will surely believe in 'Isā before his death. And on the Day of Resurrection he will be against them a witness

In this verse the antecedent of the personal pronouns به and موتہ is Sayyidunā 'Isā ﷺ. The meaning of the verse is that in future times all the people of the book who will be present, they will believe in Sayyidunā 'Isā ﷺ before his (Sayyidunā 'Isā ﷺ's) demise. This verse is a clear proof to the fact that Sayyidunā 'Isā ﷺ has not yet passed away and he will return close to *Qiyāmah*. All the commentators have taken this meaning from the verse. Accordingly, in the famous Hadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Hurayrah رضى الله عنه، ليوشكن أن ينزل فيكم النخ، the following words appear at the end، إن شئتم فاقروا وإن من أهل الكتاب ألا ليؤمنن به قبل موته. After narrating the Hadīth, Sayyidunā Abū Hurayrah رضى الله عنه presented this verse as an attestation. Since this matter is not based on relative deduction (*Qiyās*), therefore this commentary holds the status of a *marfū'* Hadīth. For this reason, this is not merely a statement of Sayyidunā Abū Hurayrah رضى الله عنه، but it is a commentary from Rasūlullāh ﷺ himself. No person's commentary which is contrary to this can be accepted.

The previous senior commentators have also presented this verse as a proof to the descent of Sayyiduna 'Isā ﷺ. See,

A. ‘Allāmah Sha’rānī writes in *Al-Yawāqīt Wal-Jawāhir*,

فان قيل فما الدليل على نزول عيسى عليه السلام من القرآن فالجواب
الدليل على نزوله قوله تعالى وإن من أهل الكتاب ألا ليؤمنن به قبل
موتهⁱ

If someone asks for a proof on the descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ from the Noble Qur’ān, then this verse is the proof for his descent, ‘The people of the scripture will believe in him before his demise’.

B. Mullā ‘Alī Qārī ﷺ writes,

و نزول عيسى من السماء كما قال الله تعالى وإنه اي عيسى لعلم
للساعة اي علامة القيامة و قال الله تعالى وإن من أهل الكتاب ألا
ليؤمنن به قبل موته أي قبل موت عيسى بعد نزوله عند قيام الساعة
فيصير الملل ملة واحدةⁱⁱ

The descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ in the word of Allāh ﷻ, ‘He, i.e. Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is a sign of Qiyāmah’. And, ‘The people of the scripture will believe in him after his descent from the heavens, before his death close to Qiyāmah’. Thus, all the

ⁱ Al-Yawāqīt Wal-Jawāhir vol.2 p.229

ⁱⁱ Sharh Fiqh-ul-Akbar p.136

religions will become one.

MIRZĀ'Ī OBJECTION

In order to nullify the deduction on the descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ from this verse, the Mirzā'īs say that the personal pronoun of قبل موته does not refer back to Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ. In fact, it refers back to the people of the book. (Therefore,) the meaning is that every person of the people of the book will believe in him (Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ) before his (that person's) death. Accordingly, some commentators have made the people of the book the antecedent of this personal pronoun. The inconsistent (*Shādh*) *Qirā'at* قبل موتهم also serves as a support to this view.

Answer 1:

The first point is that it is meaningless and useless to debate in this regard after receiving the narrated commentary of Sayyidunā Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه. The commentators who have made the people of the book the antecedent of the personal pronoun of قبل موته, just like the majority of the *Ummah*, they too hold the view of the physical (bodily) ascension and descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ. If they were to be followed, then they should also be followed in this view (of theirs). Besides this, Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn Bherwī has himself made Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ the antecedent of قبل موته in his book

Fasl-ul-Khitāb, (a book authenticated and praised by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī).

Answer 2:

If قبل موتهم is accepted, then a consistent (*Mutawātir*) *Qirā'at*, which is قبل موته, will be subjected to (made Tābī' to) an inconsistent (*Shādh*) *Qirā'at*, which is principally incorrect.

NINTH PROOF

Allāh ﷻ mentions,

﴿وَإِنَّهُ لَعَلُّ السَّاعَةِ فَلَا تَمْتَرَنَّ بِهَا وَاتَّبِعُونِ هَذَا صِرَاطٌ مُسْتَقِيمٌ﴾ الزخرف: ٦١

And indeed, he is a sign for the Hour, so be not in doubt of it, and follow Me. This is the straight path

This verse is also a clear proof that Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ will descend close to *Qiyāmah*. All the commentators have made Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ the antecedent of انه. They have said that the return of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ to the world is from amongst the signs of *Qiyāmah*. Shāh 'Abd-ul-Qādir Sāhib ﷺ [who is the *Mujaddid* of the thirteenth century according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī] has also made the same translation. Similarly, it passed earlier in a citation that in *Sharh Fiqh-ul-Akbar*, Mullā 'Ālī Qārī ﷺ has presented this verse as a proof to the affirmation on the descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ. The interesting part is that Allāh ﷻ also caused

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī to write in support of this. In *I'jāz-Ahmadi*ⁱ although Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has made up his own commentary (there), he has made Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ the antecedent of the personal pronoun of قبل موته.

TENTH PROOF

In the Noble Qur'ān whilst enumerating the bounties upon Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ, says,

﴿وَيُكَلِّمُ النَّاسَ فِي الْمَهْدِ وَكَهْلًا﴾ آل عمران: ٤٦

He will speak to the people in the cradle and in maturity

METHOD OF EXTRAPOLATION

There are two points mentioned in this verse. The first point is that Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ will speak in his infancy in the cradle, the details of which appear in the second *Rukū'* of *Sūrah Maryam*. The second point is that he will speak in middle age. Now when we look at the blessed life of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ we find that the one point regarding him has been fulfilled, i.e. speaking in the cradle. However, the second point has still not been fulfilled, because there is agreement that the incident of the cross and the assassination or ascension took place

ⁱ I'jāz Ahmadi, with the name addendum to Nuzūl-ul-Masīh, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.19 p.130

during his youth. He had still not entered his middle-age (when the incident occurred). It is not possible that the command of Allāh ﷻ be incorrect or that His stated bounties be against the actual reality. Therefore, we would have to say that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ will return to the world. Then (in this way) his speaking in middle-age will be established and the substantiation of the verse of the Noble Qur’an will be completed. The meaning of the above verse cannot be correct without accepting this. Here, this point should also be kept in mind that this verse has been presented to express the bounties of Allāh ﷻ. In this verse, in a certain way, the favours of Allāh ﷻ have been counted upon Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. The mention of speaking in the cradle and (speaking) during middle-age appears under this context (of counting the favours of Allāh ﷻ on Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ). To speak in the cradle is clearly a great favour (of Allāh ﷻ). Generally this does not happen. (Speaking in) middle-age has been mentioned together with it (speaking in the cradle). Therefore, the (speaking in) middle-age has to also be the same, in which an extraordinary matter is found just like (an extraordinary matter is found in) speaking in the cradle. This (for an extraordinary matter to be found when speaking in middle-age) can only be possible when the ‘middle-age after the descent from the heavens’ is intended. The reason being, generally every person speaks during middle-age. What is the reason to count it as a favour?

If a normal middle-age is intended, then this speech would be meaningless, just as a certain poet praised his beloved in this way,

دندان تو جمله در دهانند

چشمان تو زیر ابرو هانند

All your teeth are in your mouth

Your eyes are under your eyebrows

In reality, this is no praise and it is not something worth mentioning. Besides this, the previous reliable commentators have also taken same meaning that we have explained for the above verse. Analyse (the following),

ان المراد بقوله كهلا أن يكون كهلا بعد أن ينزل من السماء في آخر الزمان و
يكلم الناس و يقتل الدجال قال الحسين بن الفضل و في هذه الآية نص في أنه
سينزل إلى الأرضⁱ

The command of Allāh ﷻ كهلا means that in the final era after descending from the heavens, (Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ) will reach old age and he will speak to the people. He will also kill Dajjāl. Husayn Ibn Fadl says that this verse is a clear proof of (Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ) returning to the world.

This is the commentary of Imām Rāzī رحمه الله, who is the

ⁱ Tafsīr Rāzī vol.2 p. 474, Khāzin vol.2 p.291

Mujaddid of the sixth century according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

ELEVENTH PROOF

﴿وَإِذْ كَفَفْتُ بَنِي إِسْرَءِيلَ عَنْكَ﴾ المائدة: ١١٠

And when I restrained the children of Israel from you

This verse was also brought to express the favours of Allāh ﷻ on Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. The correlation of this verse will only be correct when it is established that the enemies of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ could not oppress him due to the protection of Allāh ﷻ, and Allāh ﷻ protected him from the reach of the enemies (the Jews) and raised him to a place where the enemies could not reach, i.e. raised him to the heavens. If it is said that the *Banī Isrā’īl* hit Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ so much that his ribs broke, a crown of thorns was put on him until he was put on the cross, May Allāh ﷻ protect us, just as it is the belief of the Mirzā’īs, then all these things will be against the stated verse. These things are such that no person of *īmān* will accept them. Then how was this a favour? According to the commentary of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī it cannot be a favour. The speech of Allāh ﷻ, May Allāh ﷻ protect us, will then prove to be futile.

TWELFTH PROOF

﴿وَإِذْ عَلَّمْتُكَ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ وَالتَّوْرَةَ وَالْإِنْجِيلَ﴾ المائدة: ١١٠

*And when I taught you the books and wisdom and the
Taurat and the Bible*

It is the phrasing of the Noble Qur'ān that when (the word) الحِكْمَة appears with (the word) الكتاب, then it (الحِكْمَة) refers to the *Sunnah* of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. In the above verse the bounty of teaching Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ the Noble Qur'ān and the *Sunnah* has been mentioned. This is a clear proof that Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ will be present in a time (before which) the revelation of the Noble Qur'ān would have completed. It will be the time when he will descend. This is the reason that no other Nabī was taught the Noble Qur'ān, because it was not decreed for any Nabī other than Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ to return to the world after the *Nubuwwat* of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

CLEARING A DOUBT

This verse also clears another doubt of the Qādiyānīs. They say - according to you Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ will return to the world. So will he enrol in any Madrasah to learn the Noble Qur'ān and Hadīth? Or will Jibrīl ﷺ come (to teach him), because he (Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ) would have not (yet) read the Noble Qur'ān on the earth, (because his ascension occurred before the revelation of the Noble Qur'ān)? The answer is found in this verse - that Allāh ﷻ Himself will teach him the Noble Qur'ān and Hadīth in heavens and then send

him, just as the Taurat and Injīl (Bible) were taught to him. And like Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, if he (Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ) even learns from a certain Fadl-Ilāhī, then what difference would it make? When Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī learns the Noble Qur’ān from Fadl-Ilāhī (the teacher of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī), then it makes no difference in him being the Messiah, (but) they (the Qādiyānīs) have an objection on Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. It should be remembered that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ will not learn from any person by the name of Fadl-Ilāhī, in fact he will learn from Ilāhī Fadl (The Gracious Creator).

SECOND DISCUSSION: PROOF OF ASCENSION & DESCENT FROM THE AHĀDĪTH

First Hadīth:

عن عبدالله ابن عمر (رضي الله عنهما) قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم
ينزل عيسى بن مريم (عليه السلام) إلى الأرض فيتزوج و يولد له و يمكث
خمسا و أربعين سنة ثم يموت فيدفن معي في قبريⁱ

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, ‘Īsa Ibn Maryām (ﷺ) will descend to the earth. He will then marry and have children. He will stay alive for forty-five (45) years. He will then pass away and he will be buried with me next to my grave

ⁱ Mishkāṭ-ul-Masābīh, Bāb Nuzūl ‘Īsā (ﷺ), Fasl Thālith p.480

CONFUSION OF THE MIRZĀ'IS

The Mirzā'is say in reply to this Hadīth that the following words appear in the Hadīth, *فيدفن معي في قبري*, the meaning of which is that Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ will be buried in the grave of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, whilst the reality is that no one holds this view. Therefore, the Hadīth cannot be used as a proof, due to its meaning.

If only the Mirzā'is would ask this question to their own Hadrat (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī), because he has himself accepted that the (word) 'grave' does not refer to the actual grave. In fact, the complete Rowdhah Athar, the pure room is meant here. See,

'It should be kept on the apparent meaning. It is possible that there be someone identical to the Messiah who will be by the Rowdhah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.'ⁱ

We come to know from this citation that the entire room is referred to as 'grave'. Secondly, we come to know that this Hadīth is authentic according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. It is for this reason that he is making a deduction from it. He has presented this Hadīth as a proof in many places.

Accordingly, he (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) writes in the addendum to Anjām Ātham,

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām p.471, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.3 p.352

‘In affirmation to this prophecy, Rasūlullāh ﷺ also made a prophecy from before - that يتزوج و يولد له. The promised Messiah will marry and have children.’ⁱ

After these testimonies, the Mirzā’is should not take up the courage to say that this Hadīth cannot serve as a proof.

Second Hadīth:

عن النواس بن سمعان إذ بعث الله المسيح بن مريم فينزل عند المنارة البيضاء شرقي دمشق بين مهرودتين واضعا كفيه على أجنحة ملكين الخ فيطلبه حتى يدركه بباب لد فيقتلهⁱⁱ

Suddenly Allāh ﷻ will send Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. He will descend on the white eastern Minārit of the Jāmi’ Masjid of Damascus. He will be wearing two yellow shawls and his hands will be on the wings of two angels. Then he will go in search of Dajjāl until he will find him at Bāb Ludd. He will then kill him.

The Mirzā’is make a useless attempt to apply this Hadīth on their Hadrat (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī). Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī also continued making this attempt his entire life. Sometimes he would say that the two yellow shawls

ⁱ Addendum to Anjām Ātham p.53, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.11 p.337

ⁱⁱ Sahīh Muslim vol.2 p.401, Tirmidhī vol.2 p.47

refer to my two ailments. One ailment on the bottom part of the body, i.e. to urinate a hundred times in the day and night. One ailment on the top of the body, i.e. hypochondria and melancholia. Subhanallāh, what an excellent interpretation! The heads of the Qādiyānīs bow down in shame and they begin to lament at this.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ mentioned two yellow shawls as an indication. Every person will see them. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī said that it refers to two ailments. These two ailments are such that no one can see them besides him.

Sometimes he would say that *Bāb Ludd* refers to Ludhiana. The interesting part is that after making the claim to being ‘Īsā the promised Messiah, when the scholars asked him (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) in light of the Hadīth - that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ will descend on a minaret, so which minaret did you descend on? He said, in order to fulfil the apparent words of the Hadīth, we will make a ‘Masīh minaret’. Accordingly, a notification by the name of ‘Chandā Mināret Masīh’ (contribution request for the minaret of the Messiah) was published. The collection of funds had started, (but) the funny part is that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī died and the minaret of Masīh came to completion (only) after that. Shame on such an ignorant person and his followers. Nevertheless, we present a citation below. It will become apparent from

here that even according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī *Bāb Ludd* does not refer to the city Ludhiana. In fact, it refers to a village in *Bayt-ul-Muqaddas*. Whilst translating this Hadīth, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes,

‘When he will descend, he will have yellow clothes. His palms will be on the wings of two angels. Then Sayyidunā Ibn Maryam (ﷺ) will go in search of *Dajjāl*. He will catch him and kill him at the door of Ludd, which is a village from the villages of *Bayt-ul-Muqaddas*.’ⁱ

Third Hadīth:

عن جابر رضي الله عنه قال فينزل عيسى بن مريم فيقول اميرهم تعال صل لنا
فيقول لا إن بعضكم على بعض امراء تكرمه الله هذه الأمة رواه مسلمⁱⁱ

Sayyidunā ‘Īsā (ﷺ) will descend. Their (the Muslim’s) leader (Mahdī) will say to him, come and lead us in Salāh. Sayyidunā ‘Īsā (ﷺ) will reply, no (I will not lead the Salāh). In fact some of you are leaders over others, due to Allāh (ﷻ) honouring this Ummah.

From this Hadīth we come to know two important points. Firstly, the one who will descend close to *Qiyāmah* is Masīh (ﷺ), the *Isrā’īlī* Nabī who was sent

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām p.220, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.209

ⁱⁱ Mishkāṭ-ul-Masābīḥ p.480, Sahīḥ Muslim vol.1 p.480

earlier, not any other person of this *Ummah*. Therefore, it is complete foolishness for Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī to call himself ‘Īsā. The second important point we come to know is that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ and Sayyidunā Mahdī ﷺ are two different personalities. They are not two names for one person like how Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī says. A doubt should not arise here that the Hadīth of *Sunan Ibn-Mājah*, لا مهدي إلا عيسى, is against it. The reason being that this Hadīth is not acceptable due to its chain of narration. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has also accepted that they are two different personalities. See, it is written in *Tuhfah Golrawiyyah*,

‘Therefore, we had to accept that the promised Messiah, *Mahdī* and *Dajjāl*, all three of them will appear in the east.’ⁱ

We come to know from the word ‘three’ that all three of them are different persons. If *Masīh* and *Mahdī* is one person, then three persons would not appear in the east, (in fact) two (persons) would appear.

Fourth Hadīth:

عن أبي هريرة رضي الله عنه انه قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم والله

ⁱ Tuhfah Golrawiyyah p.81, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.17 p.167

لينزلن ابن مريم حكما عدلا فليكسرن الصليب و ليقتلن الخنزير الخⁱ

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, By Allāh, (Sayyidunā) ‘Īsā Ibn Maryam (ﷺ) will descend as a just ruler. He will break the cross and kill the swine.

In this Hadīth Rasūlullāh ﷺ took an oath and prophesised that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ will descend. The guidance of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī regarding oaths has passed earlier - that no interpretation is acceptable in it. The oath is kept on its apparent meaning. Therefore, the Hadīth fully fits upon the indication that it makes and there is no room for any interpretation in it.

Fifth Hadīth:

عن أبي هريرة رضي الله عنه أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال ليس بيني وبين عيسى نبي وإنه نازل فإذا رأيتموه فاعرفوه الخⁱⁱ

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, there is no Nabī between me and (Sayyidunā) ‘Īsā (ﷺ). He will descend. When you see him, then recognise him.

(Rasūlullāh ﷺ then mentioned a few signs of his. None of these signs fit on the *Dajjāl* of Qādiyān (Mirzā

ⁱ Sahīh Muslim vol.1 p.87

ⁱⁱ Sunan Abī Dāwūd vol.2 p.254, Fath-ul-Bārī vol.6. p.357

Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī).

Clarification:

The words of the Hadīth *إنه نازل* show that the personal pronoun in *إنه* refers back Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام. He will descend close to *Qiyāmah*. He is the one who came before Rasūlullāh ﷺ. It is impossible that this personal pronoun refers back to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. It is clear from this Hadīth that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام will come himself. No *Zill* or *Burūz* of his is going to descend.

Sixth Hadīth:

عن الحسن قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لليهود إن عيسى لم يمت و
أنه راجع إليكم قبل يوم القيامةⁱ

It is narrated from Hasan Basrī رحمته الله that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said to the Jews, ‘Īsā عليه السلام did not pass away and he will return to you before Qiyāmah.

This Hadīth is a clear proof that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام did not pass away and he will return before *Qiyāmah*.

MIRZĀ’Ī OBJECTION

The Mirzā’īs make an objection to this Hadīth that

ⁱ Durr-Manthūr vol.2 p.36

between Hasan Basrī ؓ and Rasūlullāh ﷺ the link of a Sahābī is not found. Therefore, this Hadīth is *mursal* and cannot be used as a proof.

Answer:

This objection can be answered in two ways. Firstly, according to the *Mubaddithīn* the *Marāsīl* of Hasan Basrī ؓ are a proof and they fall in the category of *Marfū' Muttasil*. The reason being that he generally narrates Ahādīth from his teacher, Sayyidunā 'Ālī ؓ. The second answer is that if this Hadīth is not correct, then the Mirzā'īs should present a single Hadīth which (has subject matter that) is contrary to the subject matter (of this Hadīth), in which it is stated that Sayyidunā 'Īsā ؑ has passed away, even if it is a *mursal* Hadīth, like the Hadīth stated.

Seventh Hadīth:

الأنبياء إخوة لعلات أمهاتهم شتى ودينهم واحد وانا اولى الناس بعيسى بن
مريم لأنه لم يكن بيني وبينه نبي وأنه نازل فإذا رأيتموه فاعرفوهⁱ

The Ambiyā' are like paternal brothers. Their mothers are different and their religion is one. I am the closest to 'Īsā Ibn Maryam because there is no Nabī between me and him. Certainly, he will descend. When you see him, recognise him.

ⁱ Sunan Abī Dāwūd vol.2 p.238

Eighth Hadīth:

الستم تعلمون أن ربنا حي لا يموت و أن عيسى يأتي عليه الفناءⁱ

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said these words to a Christian delegation during a debate. He (ﷺ) said, how can Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ be the lord when he will pass away. If Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ had passed away before this time, then Rasūlullāh ﷺ would have said, اتي عليه الفناء (he has passed away).

Here the Mirzā’is make a claim with full force that in the above Hadīth the words اتي عليه الفناء are correct. (They say) this proves the demise of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ.

Answer:

It is our claim that the words ياتي عليه الفناء appear in the Hadīth. In the reliable books of Hadīth and Tafsīr the Hadīth is narrated with these words. The words اتي عليه الفناء, which are quoted from ‘Allāmāh Wāhidī, are not correct. The reason being that the author of *Tafsīr Gharā’ib-ul-Qur’ān*, ‘Allāmāh Nizām-ud-Dīn Alqamī himself narrates in his *Tafsīr* the words ياتي عليه الفناء from ‘Allāmāh Wāhidī.ⁱⁱ

ⁱ Tafsīr Gharā’ib-ul-Qur’ān vol.1 p.295, Footnotes of Tafsīr Ibn-Jarīr Tabarī vol.3 p.130

ⁱⁱ Check vol.1 p.295

OUR CHALLENGE

In the above Hadīth the following words are clearly established for Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ, ياتى, يموت، يدفن، يتزل etc. All these words are *mudārī*. They are a clear proof that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ will return and he has not passed away. If this is not correct, then we make a challenge to all the Mirzā’is that they should present a single authentic Hadīth which is contrary to these words. *Inshā Allāh*, they will not be able to prove it until *Qiyāmāh*. If any person can prove it, then he will receive a cash reward of ten thousand (10 000) Rupees for every word. Is there any son of his father who is a warrior of the field?

The second important point is that the prophecy on the descent of Ibn Maryam ﷺ appears in different places in the Ahādīth. We come to know from here that the Masīh who will come is the son of Sayyidah Maryam ﷺ. Therefore, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī who is not Ibn Maryam, in fact he is Ibn Chirāg Bibī, can never be the substantiation of these Ahādīth. Any person who (tries to) prove that (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) is the promised *Masīh* through any (type of) interpretation, then such a person together with lamenting upon his intellect, he should also think that by him making this interpretation he is acting openly against the clear guidance of his Hadrat Sāhib (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī), (which is that an

interpretation is not allowed for a statement made under oath) and he is being presumptuous in making *Jahannam* his abode. This clear guidance of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī appears in his book *Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā*ⁱ.

QĀDIYĀNĪ CHALLENGE

In order to influence the ignorant Muslims, the Mirzā's make a challenge. They say, show us a Hadīth that clearly has the words من السماء (from the heavens) and جسد عنصري (physical body) in it.

INTERESTING REFERENCE

We present the references of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī below, in which he has clearly admitted that the prophecies from the Ahādīth on the descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ have been established with *Tawātur*. If the Mirzā's have a little bit of shame and sense of honour, then in accordance with the objective of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī they should accept the belief on the descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ with an open heart.

First Citation:

‘The prophecy on the return of Masīh Ibn Maryam ﷺ

ⁱ *Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā* p.14, *Rūhānī Khazā'in* vol.7 p. 192 (on the footnotes)

is a prophecy of the first degree. Everyone has unanimously accepted it. (From amongst) the prophecies mentioned in the *Sihāb*, no prophecy is equal to it. This prophecy has obtained the first degree of *Tawātur*.ⁱ

Second Citation:

‘We would first like to clarify that according to the bible and our Ahādīth, two *Ambiyā*’ are believed to have gone to the heavens with their bodies. The first is Yuhanna, whose name is Īlyā and Idrīs. The second is Masīh Ibn Maryam, who is also referred to as ‘Īsa and Yasū. Some chapters of the old and new testament make mention of these two Nabīs, that both of them were raised to the heavens and they will return to the world some time later. And you will see them coming from the heavens. We also find words similar to these in the Ahādīth.’ⁱⁱ

From this reference, both the demands of the Mirzā’īs, the words ‘heaven’ and ‘physical body’ have been established from the Ahādīth through the pen of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

Third citation:

‘The words appear in *Sahih Muslim* that when

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām p.557, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.3 p.400

ⁱⁱ Towdhīh-ul-Marām p.3, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.3 p.52

Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ will descend from the heavens, his clothes will be yellow in colour.ⁱ

Do clothes come over the soul or physical body?

Fourth Citation:

إن المسيح ينزل من السماء بجميع علومه و لا يأخذ شيئاً من الأرض ما لهم لا
يشعرونⁱⁱ

It also becomes clear from here that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ will descend after obtaining the Sharī’ah of Muhammed ﷺ and other knowledge, in the heavens. He will not be the student of anyone on the earth (whilst the reality is that whatever Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī learnt, he learnt it from teachers in this world, the mention of which was made earlier).

The Mirzā’īs should open their eyes and read these references carefully. They should practice on the echo of their conscience and permanently repent from a belief which is contrary to this. This is the only road for goodness in the world and hereafter.

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām p.81, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.142

ⁱⁱ Ā’inah Kamālat-Islām, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.5 p.409

FEATURES OF SAYYIDUNĀ ‘ĪSĀ ﷺ

We present a few narrations on the features of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ,

1. رجل آدم كأحسن ما أنت راء من آدم الرجال، سبط الشعر، له لمة
كأحسن ما أنت راء من اللمم تضرب لمته بين منكبيه يقطر راسه ماء
ربعة احمر كأنها خرج من ديماسⁱ

2. رجل مربع إلى الحمرة و البياض بين ممصرتين كأن راسه يقطر وإن لم
يصبه بللⁱⁱ

3. عليه برنس له مربع الخلق صلت الجبين، سبط الشعرⁱⁱⁱ

Lexical Meanings:

أدم: Wheat colour

سبط الشعر: Straight hair

لمة: Hair-locks

ربعة: Moderate height

ديماس: Bathroom

ممصرتين: Two light yellow shawls

صلت: Wide

ⁱ Fath-ul-Bārī vol.6 p.349 and vol.13 p.85

ⁱⁱ Sunan Abī Dāwūd vol.4 p.117, cited from At-Tasrīh Bimā Tawātara Fī Nuzūl-il-Masīh p. 140

ⁱⁱⁱ Kanz-ul-‘Ummāl vol.7 p.268, cited from At-Tasrīh p.223

Long Topī : البرنس

Commentary:

(قوله في صفة عيسى ربعة) هو بفتح الراء و سكون الموحدة و يجوز فتحها وهو المربوع والمراد أنه ليس بطويل جدا و لا قصير جدا بل وسط و قوله من ديباس هو بكسر المهملة و سكون التحتانية و آخره مهملة (قوله ديباس يعني الحمام) هو تفسير عبد الرزاق و لم يقع ذلك في رواية هشام و الديباس في اللغة السرب و يطلق ايضا على الكن و الحمام من جملة الكن و المراد من ذلك وصفه بصفاء اللون و نضارة الجسم و كثرة ماء الوجه حتى كأنه كان في موضع فخرج منه وهو عرقان و سياتي في رواية ابن عمر هذا ينطف راسه ماء^١

The summary of this text is that مربوع means ‘moderate height’, which is not very long or short. ديباس means bathroom. It is to show the elegance of the colour of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ, the beauty of his body and the great amount of water on his face, as though he has emerged from a certain place full of perspiration.

RECONCILIATION OF THE NARRATIONS

There seems to be contradictions with regards to two aspects of the features of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ.

1. It is stated in some Ahādīth that he will have curly hair whilst it is stated in others that he will

^١ Fath-ul-Bārī vol.6 p.375

have straight hair.

2. It is stated in some Ahādīth that he will be red in colour whilst it is stated in others that he will be wheat coloured.

Reconciliation:

1. In the narrations the word جعد is the quality of the body and not the hair. It means that his body will be muscular and he will be strong.
2. The colour of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is wheat. احمر is stated due to him being reddish (in complexion). Humans have only three colours, white, black and wheat. The other colours are only a glimpse. No person is blue or snuff colour or red in colour. These colours sometimes give off a glimpse, which is referred to as ‘white towards redness or ‘wheat towards redness’ or ‘black towards blue’

Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is ‘wheat towards redness’ in colour. The glimpse was made to stand out, so ‘red’ was said. Therefore, there is no contradiction. Due to some temporary cause the redness will be apparent on his face. In one narration the following words appear, انه مربوع الى الحمرة والبياض. These words support this interpretation. We present the text of Ibn-Hajar رحمه الله for the scholars,

و وقع في رواية سالم الآتية في نعت عيسى أنه آدم سبط الشعر و وصفه

بالجعودة في جسمه لا شعره و المراد بذلك اجتماعه و اكتنازه و هذا الاختلاف في نظير الاختلاف في كونه آدم او أحمر و الأحمر عند العرب الشديد البياض مع الحمرة و الادم الاسمر و يمكن الجمع بين الوصفين بأنه أحمر بسبب كالتعب وهو في الأصل أسمرⁱ

The *Muhaddithīn* have completed their responsibility of removing the contradiction. There remains no contradiction. Woe unto the Qādiyānīs who make the difference of interpretation the basis of difference in belief. Beliefs cannot be established through these types of weak proofs.

PROOF OF ASCENSION & DESCENT FROM THE CONSENSUS OF THE UMMAH

We present a few texts below to show that it is the unanimous belief of the *Ummah* that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ ascended to the heavens with his body and he will descend close to *Qiyāmah*.

- a. ‘There is consensus amongst the *Ummah* on the descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. None of the scholars of *sharī’ah* have differed on it. The philosophers and atheists, whose disagreement is not considered, reject it.’ⁱⁱ

ⁱ Fath-ul-Bārī vol.6 p.377

ⁱⁱ Sharh ‘Aqīdah Safārīniyyah vol.2 p.90

- b. ‘Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ being alive with his body up to this day and his descent from the heavens with his body, it is from amongst the beliefs upon which there is consensus of the *Ummah* and regarding which the Ahādīth are *Mutawātir*.’ⁱ
- c. ‘There is consensus that he (Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ) is alive in the heavens. He will descend and kill *Dajjāl*. He will strengthen *Dīn*.’ⁱⁱ
- d. ‘There is no difference of opinion that he (Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ) will descend in the final era.’ⁱⁱⁱ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has also quoted consensus on the ascension and descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ in a number of places, for example; he writes in his book *Izālat-ul-Awhām*,

‘In fact, the truth is that we find that there is consensus amongst the latter day and earlier day scholars that *Masīh* has left this world and he is gone to the people of another world. His life is exactly the same as theirs.’^{iv}

It is established from the above text that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī initially held the view on the physical

ⁱ Tafsīr Al-Bahr-ul-Muhīt vol.2 p.473

ⁱⁱ Tafsīr Jāmi’ul-Bayān vol.3 p.184

ⁱⁱⁱ Futūhāt-Makkiyyah p.73

^{iv} Izālat-ul-Awhām p.755, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.507

(bodily) ascension and descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ in light of the Noble Qur’ān, Ahādīth, consensus of the *Ummah* and Bible, just like the entire *Ummah*. He then changed this belief which is established from the Noble Qur’ān and Hadīth due to his inspirations. He did not change it from the Noble Qur’ān. Therefore, he now has no right to present any verse or Hadīth or citation from the bible against this unanimous belief.

See in the following texts Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī changing his belief due to his inspiration,

1. و كان من مفاتيح تعليمه و عطايا تفهيمه أن عيسى بن مريم قد مات بموته الطبيعيⁱ
2. والله ما قلت قولاً في وفاة المسيح و عدم نزوله و قيامي مقامه إلا بعد الإلهام المتواتر المتتابع النازل كالوابل و بعد مكاشفات صريحة بينةⁱⁱ
3. ‘Until Allāh ﷻ did not turn my attention towards this and (until He did not) repeatedly explain to me that you are the promised Messiah and ‘Īsā (ﷺ) has passed away, until then I remained on the belief that you people hold.’ⁱⁱⁱ

The belief which is established from the Noble Qur’ān,

ⁱ Itmām-ul-Hujjah p.3, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.8 p.275

ⁱⁱ Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā p.13, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.7 p.191

ⁱⁱⁱ I’jāz-Ahmadī p.6, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.19 p.113

Hadīth and consensus of the *Ummah*, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has changed it through his inspirations only, which cannot be a proof upon another person. An inspiration which is contrary to the Noble Qur’ān and Hadīth is not an inspiration from Allāh ﷻ, it is an inspiration from *Shaytān*.

وإن الشياطين ليوحون إلى أولياءهم

To change one’s beliefs due to *Shaytānī* inspirations is the same as establishing kinship with *Shaytānī* dreams.

فاعتبروا يا أولي الابصار

Take lesson, O people of intelligence

REFUTATION OF THE MIRZĀ’Ī PROOFS FROM THE QUR’ĀN ON THE DEMISE OF SAYYIDUNĀ ‘ĪSĀ ﷺ

A Muslim debater should also keep in mind the proofs that the Mirzā’īs present for their belief that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ has passed away. Generally they present four (4) verses and fool the masses. We will first present those verses and the Mirzā’īs method of deduction. Then we will present with it a silencing answer to every incorrect interpretation of theirs.

First Verse:

﴿فَلَمَّا تَوْفَّيْتَنِي كُنْتَ أَنتَ الْقَرِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَنْتَ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ شَهِيدٌ﴾ المائدة: ١١٧

*When You took me up, You were the Guardian over them,
and You are, over all things, Witness*

MIRZĀ'Ī EXTRAPOLATION

This verse is a proof that Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ has passed away. If we do not accept that he has passed away, then the objection will come about that Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ is responsible for the corruption of the present day Christians. The reason being that he (Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ) said in reply, as long as I was alive I kept watch on them. However, when you gave me death, then I no longer remained responsible (over them). We come to know from this reply (of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ) that he has passed away, otherwise he (Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ) would be responsible for the corruption of the Christians up to this day. Secondly, if it is not accepted that he has passed away, then it would be necessary that he knows the condition of his *Ummah*, irrespective of whether when he is in the heavens or after his descent to the earth. Then, when he will be questioned on the day of *Qiyāmāh* regarding his *Ummah*, i.e. the Christians, why will he then express unawareness. Therefore, if it is believed that he is alive, then his expressing unawareness would be a complete lie, which is not the status of a Nabī. Being unaware can only be correct when he would have not become aware of the condition of his *Ummah* due to passing away (earlier). Therefore,

it would be necessary to say that he has passed away and he will not return close to *Qiyāmah*, and neither will he become aware of the corruption of his people.

RESPONSE

This long story of the Mirzā'is can maybe tempt the ignorant people and those who are unacquainted with the Noble Qur'ān. However, for the scholars and those who understand the objective of the person upon whom the revelation came down, this deduction has no status. This building of words can be destroyed in three ways.

Answer 1:

In the verse, the meaning of the word *توفيتني* is not 'death'. In fact, the meaning is 'ascension' and 'to take'. All the commentators and reformers have taken this meaning from the verse. In the collection of *Ahādīth* and *Tafsīr* we do not find the statement of a single reliable *Mufasssir* or *Muhaddith* that this verse indicates towards the death of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ. If any *Mufasssir* has taken the meaning of *توفى*, which appears in this verse, to be 'death', then it is our challenge that present the name (of the *Mufasssir*). Bring your proof if you are truthful.

Answer 2:

There is no comparison between death and life in this

verse. (The comparison) is only of being present and absent, for which the words ما دمت فيهم are a clear proof. Accordingly, ما دمت حيا was not mentioned. In fact, ما دمت فيهم was mentioned. We come to know from here that he (Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ) is a guardian of the *Ummah* when he is present amongst them and he is not responsible for them when he is not present amongst them. The words themselves indicate to the point that there would be an era wherein Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ would not be present amongst his *Ummah* despite being alive. Accordingly, according to us it refers to the period after his ascension to the heavens.

Answer 3:

The claim of the Mirzā'īs, 'the distinguishing factor between becoming corrupt and not becoming corrupt is death', is unsubstantiated. In fact, the writings of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī testify to the point that the Christians had already adopted incorrect beliefs after Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ went to Kashmīr, before his death. Check *Chashmā Ma'rifat*ⁱ. Now, if 'death and life' is

ⁱ *Chashmā Ma'rifat**, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.23 p.266

Tuhfah Golrawiyyah, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.17 p.311

* 'Thirty (30) years had hardly passed upon the Bible when instead of the worship of One Allāh, the worship of a weak human had taken its place, i.e. Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ was made god.' (*Chashmā Ma'rifat* p.254, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.23 p.266)

made the distinguishing factor between becoming corrupt and not becoming corrupt, then the objection that the Mirzā'īs raise against us also falls on them. Therefore, we come to know that they also believe that the distinguishing factor is the presence and absence of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ, and this is our objective.

Answer 4:

The point stated by the Mirzā'īs, 'Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ expressing unawareness about the condition of his Ummah is a proof of his death', this statement is (due to) crooked understanding and knavery. We come to know from the verse of the Noble Qur'ān that Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ will not be questioned regarding being

It is clear from this text that the corruption had occurred during the lifetime of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ, because Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes,

'The incident of the cross occurred to Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ when he was only thirty-three years and six months. It is certain that the Bible was revealed before the incident of the cross. It is also established from the statement of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī that Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ remained alive for one hundred and twenty years.'

(Check Tuhfah Golrawiyyah p.127, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.17 p.311)

By merging the two texts stated above, we come to know that the Christians had become corrupt when Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ was sixty-three (63) years old and they remained corrupt for approximately fifty-seven (57) years of his lifetime.

aware or unaware of the condition of his *Ummah*. In fact, he will be asked if he commanded his *Ummah* to make him and his mother deities besides Allāh ﷻ.

THE MATTER IS ABOUT WORD; NOT KNOWLEDGE

Here the negation is made about the word and not about having knowledge. What the Qādiyānīs say, 'Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ will be asked if he had the knowledge (of the condition of his *Ummah*) and he will express unawareness (to it)', this is all nonsense, lies and open deception. They are fabricating lies against the Noble Qur'ān with great boldness. The regrettable part is that some of our simple minded brothers, instead of objecting to their lies, accept their lies to be the truth and they become influenced. See the verses of the Noble Qur'ān in which Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ rejects these words,

﴿وَإِذْ قَالَ اللَّهُ يٰعِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ أَنْتَ قُلْتَ لِلنَّاسِ اتَّخِذُونِي وَأُمِّي آلِهَتَيْنِ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ قُلْ سُبْحَانَكَ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَنْ أَقُولَ مَا لَيْسَ لِي بِحَقِّ إِنْ كُنْتُ قُلْتُهُ فَقَدْ عَلِمْتَهُ تَعْلَمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِي وَلَا أَعْلَمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِكَ إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ عَلَّامُ الْغُيُوبِ ﴿١١٦﴾ مَا قُلْتُ لَهُمْ إِلَّا مَا أَمَرْتَنِي بِهِ أَنْ أَعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ رَبِّي وَرَبَّكُمْ وَكُنْتُ عَلَيْهِمْ شَهِيدًا مِمَّا دُمْتُ فِيهِمْ فَلَمَّا تَوَفَّيْتَنِي كُنْتُ أَنْتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَنْتَ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ

شَهِيدٌ ﴿١١٧﴾ المائدة: ١١٦ - ١١٧

And when Allāh will say, "O 'Īsā, Son of Maryam, did you say to the people, 'Take me and my mother as deities besides Allāh?'" He will say, "Exalted are You! It was not for me to

say that to which I have no right. If I had said it, You would have known it. You know what is within myself, and I do not know what is within Yourself. Indeed, it is You who is the Knower of the unseen

I said not to them except what You commanded me - to worship Allāh, my Rabb and your Rabb.

It is never understood from this verse that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is expressing unawareness about the condition of his people. (When it is not the case that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is expressing unawareness about the condition of his people), then how can the second point, i.e. his death, be built upon it? The expression of unawareness that appears in the middle of the verse, it is the expression of him (Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ) having no knowledge in front of the knowledge of Allāh ﷻ, just like when the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ will be asked about their *Ummahs*, ‘what answer did they (your *Ummah*) give to you, then they (the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ) will say the same thing, لا علم لنا. Allāh ﷻ says,

﴿يَوْمَ يَجْمَعُ اللَّهُ الرُّسُلَ فَيَقُولُ مَاذَا أُجِبْتُمْ قَالُوا لَا عِلْمَ لَنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ عَلَّامُ الْغُيُوبِ﴾

المائدة: ١٠٩

The Day when Allāh will assemble the messengers and say, "What was the response you received?" They will say, "We have no knowledge. Indeed, it is You who is the Knower of the unseen"

Answer 4:

Granted that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ expressed unawareness about the condition of his *Ummah* in front of Allāh ﷻ or that he will express (unawareness about the condition of his *Ummah* in front of Allāh ﷻ) on the day of *Qiyāmāh*, then too it does not necessitate that he has passed away and he will not return to the world. Is it not possible that he comes to know of all the conditions of his *Ummah* when he is in the heavens or (when he is) in the grave, as assumed by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī (that he is in the grave)? Therefore, ‘being unaware’ is not found. The thing the Mirzā’īs were trying to avoid, it will also become incumbent on them in this situation. The strange thing is that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has himself written in a number of places that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ has been informed in the heaven about the condition of the Christians.

1. ‘It has open up to me through inspiration that this poisonous air that has spread in the world from the Christians, Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ has been informed about it.’ⁱ
2. During the time of this mischief of the Christians, Allāh ﷻ showed this mischief to

ⁱ Ā’inah Kamālāt-Islām p.254, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.5 p.254

Sayyidunā Masīh, i.e. he was informed in the heavens about this mischief (which is) that your *Ummah* has started this chaos.ⁱ

Therefore, whatever answer the Mirzā'is will give for 'expressing unawareness' on the day of *Qiyāmāh* after having this 'knowledge', the same answer will be ours. It is no longer our responsibility to provide an answer, in fact it is theirs.

ما هو جوابكم فهو جوابنا

BITTER TIMES

The Mirzā'is have received a bitter answer for the previous deduction that they made. In order to do away with the bitterness, they came up with something. This should be remembered so that it can be answered. They say that we come to know from a Hadīth of *Sahīh Bukhārī* that on the day of *Qiyāmāh* when some people of the *Ummah* of Muhammed ﷺ will be taken towards *Jahannam*, at that time Rasūlullāh ﷺ will also say, فلما توفيتني كنت انت الرقيب عليهم. There is agreement that (the word) توفيتني in this Hadīth means death. Therefore, this meaning should also apply in the reply of Sayyidunā 'Īsā عليه السلام. Why the difference - that a different meaning is taken for Rasūlullāh ﷺ and a different meaning is taken

ⁱ Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.5 p.268 (on the footnotes)

for Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ? Therefore, in both places the meaning of death will apply.

Answer 1:

It is incorrect to deduce from this Hadīth that the statement of Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the exact same statement of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. The word *kamā* appears here. If the statement of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was the same as that of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ, Rasūlullāh ﷺ would have used the word *mā* and not *kamā*. Did an eloquent person like Rasūlullāh ﷺ not understand the difference between *mā* and *kamā*?

فيا للعجب

How astonishing!

Answer 2:

There is no need to bring up this point. We have already proven from the writings of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī that the distinguishing factor between ‘becoming corrupt’ and ‘not becoming corrupt is ‘being present and not being present’. The meaning of ‘not being present’ should be such that it also fits ‘an ascension to the heavens’ and ‘a natural death’. Therefore, the meaning of توفيتني will be different in both places. In each place, the meaning will be according to the condition in light of the *Mutawātir Nusūs*. When this word will be used for Rasūlullāh ﷺ, then according

to the condition (the meaning will be of) death. When the word will be used for Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ, then the meaning according to his condition will be ‘ascension to the heavens’. The people of knowledge know that in *Tashbīh* the similarity is not in every aspect.

Answer 3:

1. To make the conclusion from a general *Tashbīh* that the توفى of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and (the توفى) Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is the same in the details, this is a proof of having less understanding and not being aware of the Arabic language. The words of the Hadīth are,

فأقول كما قال العبد الصالح و كنت عليهم شهيدا ما دمت فيهم فلما
توفيتني كنت أنت الرقيب عليهمⁱ

In this Hadīth Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave *Tashbīh* to his statement with the statement of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not give *Tashbīh* of his توفى with the توفى of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ that it would necessitates that the توفى of both is of the same type.

2. It is stated in a Hadīth that the polytheists of Makkah would hang their weapons on a certain

ⁱ Mishkāṭ-ul-Masābīḥ p.483, cited from Sahīḥayn

tree. The name of the tree was *Dhāt-Anmāt*. Some of the Sahābah ﷺ made a request, ‘O Rasūlullāh (ﷺ) stipulate for us also a *Dhāt-Anmāt*. Rasūlullāh ﷺ said at that time,

هذا كما قال قوم موسى اجعل لنا الها كما لهم الهة

‘Your request is like the request of the people of Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ. When they saw the idols, they made the request, ‘O Mūsā, do also make for us a god like how these idol worshippers have a god’. No Muslim can think, May Allāh ﷻ protect us, that the Sahabāh ﷺ made a request to worship idols. The *Tashbīh* was only in the statement, that they said, اجعل لنا الها and you said اجعل لنا ذات أنماط.

3. It appears in the Noble Qur’ān,

﴿كَمَا بَدَأْنَا أَوَّلَ خَلْقٍ نُعِيدُهُ﴾ الأنبياء: ١٠٤

As We began the first creation, We will repeat it

﴿كَمَا بَدَأَكُمْ تَعُودُونَ﴾ الأعراف: ٢٩

Just as He originated you, you will return [to life]

Allāh ﷻ first created us through parents. So will He create us again on the day of *Qiyāmāh* through parents?

4. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself writes,

‘It is apparent that complete reconciliation is not necessary in *Tashbīhāt*. In fact, sometimes (the *Tashbīh*) is due to a very small similarity. In fact, one thing is given the name of another (thing) due to similitude only in a portion, for example; a brave human is called a lion. It is not necessary that he should have paws like a lion, wool on his body and a tail. In fact, he is called a lion due to the quality of bravery. Generally, this rule applies to all the types of *Isti’ārah*.’ⁱ

5. ‘Similitude (*Mumāthalat*) always demands for there to be a difference in some aspect. It is not possible that one thing is referred to as similar to itself. In fact, it is necessary for there to be some difference between the *Mushabbah* and *Mushabbah Bihī*.’ⁱⁱ
6. Similarly, in the Hadīth the objective of Rasūlullāh ﷺ from this *Tashbīh* is that in the same way that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ became separated from his people due to the ascension to the heavens and he has nothing to do with the deviation of the people who were born after him, in the same way Rasūlullāh ﷺ became separated

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām vol.1 p.72, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.138

ⁱⁱ Tuhfah Golrawiyyah, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.17 p.193

from the people after his demise. Rasūlullāh ﷺ would not know what the people did in his absence. Rasūlullāh ﷺ is free from it.”ⁱ

Answer 4:

Why is it necessary that when one word is used for two personalities then the meaning should be in both places? Due to indications and (different) degrees, a single word could have a number of meanings and it could indicate to a number of things. Accordingly, in this verse Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ has used the word *nafs* for himself and for Allāh ﷻ,

﴿تَعْلَمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِي وَلَا أَعْلَمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِكَ﴾ المائدة: ١١٦

So would the meaning of *nafs* be the same in both places? If any foolish person says that the *nafs* of Allāh ﷻ and (the *nafs*) of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is the same, then the *īmān* of such a person cannot remain safe. Similarly, when *tawaffā* is used for Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ, then in light of the Ahādīth and *Nusūs* the meaning would be of ascension. And when this word *tawaffā* is used for Rasūlullāh ﷺ, then the meaning would be of death. This is nothing farfetched.

ⁱ Ma’ārif-ul-Qur’ān (Maulānā Kāndhelwī ﷺ) vol.2 p.437

SECOND PROOF

Second Verse:

﴿مَا الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِنْ قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ﴾ المائدة: ٧٥

The Masīh, son of Mary, is not but a messenger; [many] messengers have passed before him.

Third Verse:

﴿وَمَا مُحَمَّدٌ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِنْ قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ﴾ آل عمران: ١٤٤

And Muhammad (ﷺ) is not but a messenger. [Many] messengers have passed before him.

EXTRAPOLATION

It is established from the two verses stated above that just as all the Rusūl before Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ have passed away and death came to them, in the same manner all the Rusul before Rasūlullāh ﷺ have also passed away, and Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is also from amongst them.

Answer 1:

There is no commentator or reformer who made this deduction from these verses. If you have courage, then present (their names).

Answer 2:

The citation had passed earlier that according to the

Mirzā'is, Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ is alive in the heavens. Therefore, in the presence of these verses whatever answer the Mirzā'is will present regarding Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ being alive, the same should be understood to be our answer.

Answer 3:

The reality is that this deduction is an open proof to the deception of the Mirzā'is. The reason being that in the stated verses the meaning of خَلَتْ is not 'to die'. In fact (the meaning is) 'to pass before' and 'to empty a place'. It is in the meaning of مضت. All the commentators have taken this meaning. Examples of this are found in the other verses of the Noble Qur'an,

﴿وَإِذَا خَلَوْا عَصَوْا عَلَيْهِمْ أَلْتَئَامًا مِّنَ الْغِيْظِ﴾ آل عمران: ١١٩

And when they separate, they bite their fingertips at you in rage.

﴿كَذَٰلِكَ أَرْسَلْنَاكَ فِيْ أُمَّةٍ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِن قَبْلِهَا أُمَمٌ﴾ الرعد: ٣٠

Similarly, We have sent you to a community before which [other] communities have passed on

Did all the previous *Ummahs* die?

OBJECTION TO THE ANSWER

When the Mirzā'is hear the above answer, they say that we accept that here خلت is in the meaning of مضت (to

pass). However, the Noble Qur'ān has itself explained how this 'passing (of the Rusul)' occurred. Accordingly, the Noble Qur'ān says,

﴿أَفَايُن مَّاتَ أَوْ قُتِلَ﴾ آل عمران: ١٤٤

So if he was to die or be killed

Therefore, we come to know that these two situations (to die or be killed) are also restricted for all the *Ambiyā'* ﷺ before Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The ascension to the heavens is not part of these two situations. Therefore, it cannot be affirmed.

Answer 1:

There is no restriction here. General situations have been mentioned. The situation of an 'ascension' is (a specific) situation (and not a general situation). (Therefore,) it has not been mentioned (because) something rare is like something non-existent.

Answer 2:

If the matter is as the Mirzā'is say, then (our question to them is) how did Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ go to the heavens, because Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī believes that he (Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ) is gone to the heavens? Just as the Mirzā'is establish the ascension of Sayyidunā 'Mūsā ﷺ to the heavens and the stated verses do not serve as an impediment for it, in the same

manner we believe in the ascension of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. There is no verse of the Noble Qur’ān which is in conflict with our belief.

CLAIM OF IJMĀ’ OF THE UMMAH OF THE DEMISE OF SAYYIDUNĀ ‘ĪSĀ ﷺ

The Mirzā’is say that even in the sermon of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ a restriction was made on ‘dying’ and ‘being killed’. There is no mention of ‘the ascension’. We come to know from here that also with the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ before Rasūlullāh ﷺ only these two situations occurred. There was no third situation (ascension etc.) that had occurred. The Sahabāh ﷺ did not make an objection on the sermon of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ. Therefore, this is a matter upon which consensus has been reached.

Answer 1:

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself admits that the statement of Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ in the reply of which Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ delivered this sermon, the ascension of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ was mentioned in it (the statement of Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ). Accordingly, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī writes in *Tuhfah Ghaznawiyyah*ⁱ,

ⁱ Tuhfah Gaznawiyyah, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.15 p.580

‘In *Al-Milal Wan-Nihal* of (Muhammad) Al-Shahrastānī the following text appears in relation to this incident:

قال عمر بن الخطاب من قال إن محمدا مات فقتلته بسييفي هذا، وإنما رفع إلى السماء كما رفع عيسى بن مريم^١

Here, Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه made Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام the *Maqīs ‘Alayh* and he made the ascension of Sayyidunā Muhammad عليه السلام the *Maqīs*. In reply, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه only negated the *Maqīs*. He did not refute the *Maqīs ‘Alayh*, because it was an established point according to everyone. The Sahābah رضي الله عنهم did not express disapproval on this refutation of his. Therefore, consensus has been reached on the ascension of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام. However, Rasūlullāh عليه السلام did not have an ascension like this. Therefore, this incident is a clear proof that all the Sahābah رضي الله عنهم believed in the physical (bodily) ascension of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام.

The objection made is that how did Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه say this when the blessed body of Rasūlullāh عليه السلام was present? The answer is that his senses were affected due to grief.

وكان من الحزن كالمجانين

¹ Al-Milal Wan-Nihal p.15

Out of grief he had become like an insane personⁱ

Answer 2:

The claim that there is consensus amongst the Sahābah رضي الله عنهم on the demise of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام is incorrect. We have a number of proofs for this, for example; Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself refutes (the claim) that there was consensus of the Sahābah رضي الله عنهم. Accordingly, he writes,

1. ‘O Maulwīs, when the demise of *Masīh* is established from the Noble Qur’ān in a general way, and from the beginning right up to this day some of the statements of the Sahābah رضي الله عنهم and the commentators also accept it, so then why are you wrongfully being stubborn?’ⁱⁱ

Is the word ‘some’ not an open refutation to (their being) consensus (of the Sahābah رضي الله عنهم)?

2. ‘In these very same (books) of *Tafsīr*, some views have been written which are contrary to other views, for example; if it is written that it is the view of so and so that Masīh Ibn Maryam was raised alive to the heavens with his body. Then it is also written together with it that it is the view

ⁱ Tuhfah Ghaznawiyyah p.55, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.15 p.588

ⁱⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām p.469, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.3 p.351

of some (scholars) that *Masīh* has passed away. In fact, the view that (Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ) has passed away has been given preference due to the narration of the trustworthy Sahābah. It is stated that this was the view of ‘Ibn Abbās ﷺ.”ⁱ

Are all these differences not a clear refutation to (there being) consensus?

3. ‘The objection that after one thousand three hundred years, this point only became known to you, the answer is that in reality this is not a new view. The first narrator (of this view) is Ibn-‘Abbās. However, Allāh ﷻ has now opened up the reality of this view to this weak one and He has established the invalidity of the other views.”ⁱⁱ



When there were other views that were present, then can anyone say that in those days there was consensus on the death (of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ)?



4. ‘Certainly there is no consensus of the Sahābah ﷺ on this. If there is consensus, then at least mention the names of three hundred (300) or four hundred (400) Sahābah ﷺ who testified in this regard. It is an act of great dishonesty to


ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām p.756, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.508

ⁱⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām vol.2 p.459, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.345

refer to the explanation of one or two persons as consensus.ⁱ

We come to know from the references presented above that the claim of the Mirzā'īs - that there is consensus amongst the Sahābah  on the demise of Sayyidunā 'Īsā  - is baseless even according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself.

A counter question could be presented – granted that it is accepted that Sayyidunā 'Īsā  and all the Ambiyā  have passed away, then it would have to be accepted that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī was also dead when this verse was revealed, otherwise all-inclusivity would not be established.

The method that the Mirzā'īs will use to exclude Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī (from this verse), we will use the same method to exclude Sayyidunā 'Īsā  from this verse.

Answer 3:

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself has translated (the word) خلت which appears in this verse as 'to pass'. See,

'there is nothing more in Masīh Ibn Maryam than him being only a messenger, and messengers also came

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām p.303, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.3 p.255

before him.’ⁱ

Answer 4:

If Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is also included in (the) general (meaning of the word) خلت, then the Mirza’is should answer the question - did Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ also get married and have children, because the Noble Qur’ān says,

﴿وَلَقَدْ أَرْسَلْنَا رُسُلًا مِّن قَبْلِكَ وَجَعَلْنَا لَهُمْ أَزْوَاجًا وَذُرِّيَّةً﴾ الرعد: ٣٨

*And certainly We have already sent messengers before you
and assigned to them wives and descendants.*

If Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ can be excluded from this, then to a greater degree he will be excluded from the verse under discussion, because (in the verse under discussion) there are many other proofs to make the exclusion.

Answer 5:

Is the Alif Lām (*Lām At-Ta’rīf*) on (the word) الرسل for all-inclusivity (*Istighrāq*)?

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and the Mirza’is say that we come to know from the verse, قد خلت من قبله الرسل, that all the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ before Rasūlullāh ﷺ have passed away. The *Alif Lām* in this verse is for all-inclusivity. The word خلت indicates towards death.

ⁱ Jang Muqaddas, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.6 p.89

Therefore, Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ also passed away just like the other *Ambiyā’* ﷺ.

The claim of the Mirzā’is – that the *Alif Lām* in this verse is for *Istighrāq* – is invalid due to certain reasons.

Even according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī the *Alif Lām* is not for *Istighrāq*. Analyse a few citations,

1. *Ambiyā’* ﷺ kept coming before him. As for the matter that the *Alif Lām* in الرسل is for all-inclusivity, the answer is that you should first present a proof that it is for all-inclusivity. Then (present a proof) that it is actual all-inclusivity (*Haqīqī Istighrāq*). (In the verse,) وقفينا من بعده بالرسل, is the *Alif Lām* for all-inclusivity?
2. ‘و إذا الرسل اقتصت’ And when the messengers will return at the appointed time. In reality this is an indication towards the return of the promised *Masīh*. The objective is to show that he will come at the exact time. It should be kept in mind that in the Noble Qur’ān the word رسل (messengers) is also used for a single person and it is also used for a Non-Rasūl. In (the verse), إذا الرسل اقتصت, the *Alif Lām* indicates towards ‘*Abd-Khārijī*.’ⁱ

ⁱ Shahādat-ul-Qur’ān p.24

3. ⁱ Here the *Alif Lām* in (the word) الأحاديث is not for all-inclusivity, because Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself admitted that some Ahādīth are *non-Āhād*.ⁱⁱ

There are a number of verses in the Noble Qur’ān wherein the *Alif Lām* cannot be for all-inclusivity. Analyse these verses,

﴿يَأَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِن كُنْتُمْ فِي رَيْبٍ مِّنَ الْبَعْثِ فَإِنَّا خَلَقْنَاكُمْ مِّن نُّرَابٍ﴾ الحج: ٥
 ﴿يَأَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنَّا خَلَقْنَاكُمْ مِّن ذَكَرٍ وَأُنْثَى﴾ الحجرات: ١٣
 ﴿وَيَقْتُلُونَ آلَ نَبِيِّنَا بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ﴾ آل عمران: ١١٢
 ﴿وَكَانَ الْإِنْسَنُ عَجُولًا﴾ الإسراء: ١١
 ﴿وَكَانَ الْإِنْسَنُ كَفُورًا﴾ الإسراء: ٦٧

Fourth Verse:

﴿كَانَا يَأْكُلَانِ الطَّعَامَ﴾ المائدة: ٧٥

They both used to eat food.

METHOD OF EXTRAPOLATION

In this verse mention is made about Sayyidah Maryām عليها السلام and Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام eating food. It is accepted that the action of eating of Sayyidah Maryam عليها السلام has

ⁱ Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.7 p.217

ⁱⁱ Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā vol.7 p.205

terminated due to (her) death. Therefore, incumbently, the termination of the eating of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ has also been established. If his eating has not terminated, then (we) should be informed of what he is eating now.

Answer 1:

Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ eats the same food Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ eats.

Answer 2:

It is not necessary for this food to be the common food (we eat). In fact, it could also refer to spiritual nourishment, which is given to the special servants of Allāh ﷻ. This is the nourishment Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ receives. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has himself admitted that the pious people receive spiritual nourishment. See,

‘On this level, the nourishment of a believer is (from) Allāh ﷻ. His life is dependent on this nourishment. The water of a believer is also (from) Allāh ﷻ. He is saved from death by drinking it. His cool breeze is also (from) Allāh ﷻ. It provides comfort to his heart.’ⁱ

Answer 3:

‘Allāmah Sha’rānī ﷺ answers this question in *Al-*

ⁱ Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah vol.5, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.21 p.216

Yawāqīt Wal-Jawāhir,

‘If someone asks regarding Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ - how is he not dependent on food and drink during his stay in the heavens when Allāh ﷻ says, ‘We have not made any body that does not eat or drink’. The answer is – food has been made the nourishment of the body for the one who lives on earth. The reason being that hot and cold air act on his body, which causes the body to reduce (in size). Allāh ﷻ has made food a replacement for this effect. As for the person whom Allāh ﷻ raises to then heavens, (then) his food is *Tasbīh* and (his) drink is *Tablīl*.’ⁱ

Answer 4:

Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ would be eating the same food Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ ate before he came to the world. They are both from the same group. Allāh ﷻ says,

﴿إِن مِّثْلَ عِيسَىٰ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ كَمِثْلِ آدَمَ﴾ آل عمران: ٥٩

Indeed, the example of (Sayyidunā) ‘Īsā (ﷺ) to Allah ﷻ is like the condition of (Sayyidunā) Ādam (ﷺ)

Answer 5:

The verse the Mirzā’is present, in actual reality it has been presented (by the Noble Qur’ān) as a proof for the

ⁱ Al-Yawāqīt Wal-Jawāhir vol.2 p.229

refutation on Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ and Sayyidah Maryam ﷺ being deities. The proof being presented is that how can those who are in need of food and drink be deities? Therefore, for the completion of this proof and for the refutation of them being deities, it would be sufficient for both of them to eat even once. (This would prove) that they were in need of food to survive. However, it is not necessary that they should always eat to prove that they are not deities. It is also not necessary that if the one stops eating, then the other one should also stop eating. This deductive reasoning is complete foolishness, for example; if someone says, ‘Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and his wife would eat together’. So by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī dying and stopping to eat, would it necessitate that his wife has also died and (she also) stopped eating. The reality is that the wife of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī remained alive for a long time after his death and she continued to eat. After the partition of the state she came to Chenab Nagar (Rabwah) in Pakistan and died there. She is (also) buried there.

Fifth Verse:

﴿وَأَوْصَانِي بِالصَّلَاةِ وَالزَّكَاةِ مَا دُمْتُ حَيًّا﴾ مريم: ٣١

And He has enjoined upon me Salāh and Zakāh as long as I remain alive

METHOD OF EXTRAPOLATION

We come to know from this verse that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ performed *Salāh* and discharged *Zakāh* his entire life. If he is alive today, then (we) should be informed that to whom does he discharge his *Zakāh* to and in which direction does he perform *Salāh*? If it is not known, then it would necessitate that he has passed away.

Answer 1:

This deduction of the Mirzā’is is a proof of their ignorance. Every Muslim is aware that *Salāh*, *Sawm* (fasting) and *Zakāh* is prescribed with certain conditions. When the time (of *Salāh*) will enter, then *Salāh* will become obligatory. When Ramadhān will come, then fasting will become obligatory. When (a person) will have the minimum amount (*Nisāb*), then it will become obligatory to discharge *Zakāh*. Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ has been raised to a place where there is no time, because the heavens are free from time. Therefore, *Salāh* is not obligatory on him (there). He continued to perform *Salāh* until it was obligatory on him, i.e. before he was raised (to the heavens). He will perform *Salāh* again when it will become obligatory on him in the future, i.e. after the descent (to the earth). Similarly, he did not previously own the minimum amount (*Nisāb*), neither will he own in the future, nor is he presently the owner of it. Therefore, *Zakāh* is not obligatory on

him. Yes, if the Mirzā'is can prove from a *shar'ī* source that Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ owns the minimum amount (*Nisāb*), then we will give the reply as to which poor persons does he give his *Zakāh* to. *Inshā Allāh*.

Answer 2:

Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ performs *Salāh* behind his predecessor, Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ, in the (same) direction he (Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ) faces.

REFUTATION OF THE MIRZĀ'Ī PROOFS FROM THE AHĀDĪTH

The Mirzā'is have searched the entire collection of Ahādīth to (try and) prove the demise of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ. However, they only found two Ahādīth, in which they forcefully tried to attain their objective. However, in light of the transmission and meaning, both narrations are not acceptable. See,

First Hadīth:

عن عائشة رضي الله عنها ان عيسى ابن مريم عاش عشرين و مائة سنة

Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ remained alive for one hundred and twenty years

The word عاش here is from the past tense. We come to know from here that after one hundred and twenty (120) years Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ passed away.

Answer 1:

This Hadīth is narrated through Ibn-Lahī'ah. The *Muhaddithīn* are unanimous that he is a rejected and unreliable (narrator). Therefore, this narration can never be accepted in the presence of authentic narrations.

Answer 2:

In accordance with their old habit of wrongful conduct, the Mirzā'is do not quote the entire Hadīth. The reason being that if they quote the entire narration then they would be exposed. The reality is light of logical reasoning and the meaning (of the Hadīth), this Hadīth is not worth being considered. The reason is that it is mentioned in the beginning of this Hadīth that every succeeding Nabī lives half the lifetime of the Nabī preceding him. Now, if this is accepted to be correct, then it would mean that the *Ambiyā'* ﷺ who came before Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ lived for thousands of years. The age of Sayyidunā 'Ādam ﷺ would become so long that the present day calculators and computers would give up.

If a calculation has to be made, then the twentieth Nabī before Rasūlullāh ﷺ, his age would be sixty two million nine hundred and fourteen thousand five hundred and sixty years. Such (a long) age is logically and generally impossible. The reality is that the Noble

Qur'ān has mentioned that the age of Sayyidunā Nūh ؑ was nine hundred and fifty years. Sayyidunā Nūh ؑ came long before Sayyidunā 'Īsā ؑ. Therefore, when the first portion of the narration is not acceptable, then how can reliance be placed on the second portion?

Answer 3:

If the first portion of the Hadīth is correct – that every succeeding Nabī lives half the lifetime of the Nabī preceding him – then in the light of this (Hadīth) Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is proven be a complete liar. The reason being that the age of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was sixty-three (63). According to this Hadīth, the age of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī should be thirty-one (31) or thirty-two (32), whilst the reality is that his age was approximately seventy (70) years.

Answer 4:

Granted that the Hadīth is acceptable, then by keeping the other *Abādīth Mutāwātirah* in front, a reconciliation of the Hadīth will be made in a manner that it does not contradict the *Nusūs*. Accordingly, Mullā 'Ālī Qārī ؒ has tried to make a reconciliation (by saying) that the life (of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ؑ) before *Nubuwwat* was forty (40) years. The life after *Nubuwwat* was thirty-three (33) years. The life after the descent close to *Qiyāmah* will be forty-five (45) years. In this way, it totals to one hundred and eighteen (118) years. The figure was

rounded off in the Hadīth and (in this way) one hundred and twenty years (120) were mentioned. The Hadīth which states that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ will only live for seven (7) years (after the descent), it would mean that he will stay alive for seven (7) years after the killing of *Dajjāl*.

Second Hadīth:

لو كان موسى و عيسى حين لما وسعها إلا اتباعي

If Mūsā and ‘Īsā were alive, then they would also have to follow me

Answer 1:

There is no chain of transmission for this Hadīth. It is an unauthentic and rejected statement. The name of Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ only appears in the authentic narration, which is found with the chain of transmission in the books of Ahādīth. The narration is recorded in *Mishkāt-ul-Masābīh*,

لو كان موسى حيا لما وسعه إلا اتباعيⁱ

The narration of *Sharh Fiqh-ul-Akbar* which they present, wherein it appears, لو كان عيسى حيا, this is a mistake of the scribe. The words recorded in the Indian copies are, لو كان موسى حيا. The commentator of *Al-Fiqh*

ⁱ *Mishkāt-ul-Masābīh* p.30

Al-Akbar, Mullā ‘Alī Qārī رحمہ اللہ, himself believes that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā رحمہ اللہ is alive and he was raised to the heavens.

Answer 2:

Granted that this Hadīth is authentic, then it is also against the Mirzā’īs. The reason being that it also establishes the death of Sayyidunā Mūsā رحمہ اللہ, whilst the reality is that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī believes that Sayyidunā Mūsā رحمہ اللہ is alive. [The reference (for this belief of his) passed earlier.]

فما هو جوابکم هو جوابنا

Answer 3:

In order to fool the masses and to ignite their emotions, the Mirzā’īs generally recite this couplet when discussing the life of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā رحمہ اللہ,

غیرت کی جا ہے عیسیٰ زندہ ہو آسمان پر

مدفون ہو زمین میں شاہِ جہاں ہمارا

A Muslim debater should not remain silent at this. In fact, he should present and explain the following three couplets in sequence. He should give the Mirzā’īs a bitter treatment. The three couplets are,

غیرت کی جا ہے عیسیٰ زندہ ہو آسمان پر

مدفون ہو زمین میں شاہِ جہاں ہمارا

(The Mirzā'is believe that Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ is alive and he was raised to the heavens.)

مصطفیٰ زیر زمین عیسیٰ نہاں بر آسمان

زیر دریا دُر شود بالا حباب ناتواں

Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ is in the heavens and Rasūlullāh ﷺ is under the earth. Pearls are (found) under the ocean and bubbles are (found) on top.

اما ترى البحر يعلو فوقه حبيب

و تستقر باقصى قعره الدرر

Do you not know that the bubbles swim on the top of the ocean

And the pearls are hidden in its depth.

Answer 4:

If the belief that Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ is alive in the heavens is disrespect to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, then for Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī to believe that Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ is alive in the heavens, is this not disrespect to Rasūlullāh ﷺ?

فما هو جوابکم هو جوابنا

Answer 5:

There is agreement that humans are the best of all creation. However, angels, who are of a lower status than humans, they are in the heavens. In fact, they are holding the throne (*‘Arsh*) of Allāh ﷻ. So, are angels superior to humans because of being on top? Kites and vultures fly on top of humans. So, are they also superior to humans? Yes, certainly they are superior to Qādiyānīs, because there is no *Jahannam* for them after death and there is *Jahannam* for the Qādiyānīs. According the *shārī’ah* of Islām the Qādiyānīs are apostates and infidels and they deserve to be killed.

CONDITION OF THE MIRZĀ’IS

From the above discussion, you would have certainly reached to the conclusion that the Mirzā’is have no proofs at all. Even if they find an insignificant point, they try to use it for their own interest. (It is like) a drowning person catching at a straw. The following quatrain aptly applies to their plight,

یہ سب آثار ہیں جہل و جنوں کے
یہ سب اطوار ہیں زار و زبوں کے
یہ چاروں لفظ ہیں مکروفسوں کے
اگر، لیکن، چنانچہ اور چوں کے



CHAPTER FIVE

KHATM-E-NUBUWWAT




CLARIFYING THE TOPIC

In order to lead the simple minded masses astray, the Mirzā'īs also use the topic of 'continuation of *Nubuwwat*', i.e. the effort to make *Nubuwwat* continue from their side. They use farfetched interpretations, baseless proofs and indecent distortions to try and attain their objective. Before discussing the topic, it is necessary to clarify the claim and (its) proofs. The discussion should not commence without clarifying it. If the claim is clarified, then the Mirzā'īs will not be able to even move an inch forward from their weak interpretations. 'Clarifying of the topic' would be a weapon that would serve as dynamite to every proof of theirs.

The Mirzā'īs do not believe that *Nubuwwat* in general continues. In fact, they believe that a specific type of *Nubuwwat* continues after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Therefore it is necessary to,

1. Clarify this specific type (of *Nubuwwat*)
2. Then in accordance with the specific claim, a specific proof should be demanded.
3. If they present a specific proof for their specific claim, then only should the matter be discussed. It should not be that the claim is specific and the proof is (a) general (proof). The reason being that this would be open dishonesty and deception. After this clarification, those citations should be remembered that point out to the claim of the Mirzā'īs, i.e. *Nubuwwat* has not terminated.

First Citation:

‘I believe that there are three types of Nabīs, namely; (1) those who receive a *sharī’ah*, (2) those who did not come with a *sharī’ah*. However, they receive *Nubuwwat* directly. They do the work of the previous *Ummah*, for example; Sayyidunā Sulaymān , Sayyidunā Zakariyyā  and Sayyidunā Yahyā . (3) The one who does not come with a *sharī’ah*, neither does he receive *Nubuwwat* directly. However, he becomes a Nabī in following the previous Nabī.ⁱ

ⁱ Qowl-Faysal (Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd) p.14

Second Citation:

‘It should be remembered at this point that *Nubuwwat* is of different types. Up to this day, *Nubuwwat* came in three ways; (1) *Tashrī’i Nubuwwat* – The promised Messiah referred to it as *Haqīqī Nubuwwat*, (2) The *Nubuwwat* for which it is not necessary to be *Tashrī’i* or *Haqīqī* – In the terminology of the promised Messiah it is a *Mustaqil Nubuwwat*, (3) *Zillī* and *Ummatī Nabī*. By the coming of Rasūlullāh ﷺ the door of *Mustaqil* and *Haqīqī Nubuwwat* has closed, and the door of *Zillī Nubuwwat* has opened.ⁱ

Third Citation:

‘The *Ambiyā’* ﷺ are of two types, (1) *Tashrī’i* and (2) *Ghayr Tashrī’i*. Then *Ghayr Tashrī’i* are also of two types. (1) those who receive *Nubuwwat* directly. (2) Those who receive *Nubuwwat* by following a *Tashrī’i Nabī*. Before Rasūlullāh ﷺ, only the first two types of Nabīs would come.’ⁱⁱ

The claim of the Qādiyānīs has become clear from the above references. According to them, two types of *Nubuwwat* have come to an end and one specific type of

ⁱ Mas’alah Kufr Wa Islām Kī Haqīqat (Mirzā Bashīr Ahmed M.A) p.31

ⁱⁱ Mubāhathah Rāwalpindī p.175

Nubuwwat, i.e. *Zillī Burūzī* (*Nubuwwat*) which is attained by following Rasūlullāh ﷺ, continues. This specific type (of *Nubuwwat*) was not found before Rasūlullāh ﷺ. It only came after Rasūlullāh ﷺ and only one person was selected to receive it. According to them this *Nubuwwat* is not *Wahabī* (gifted), but it is *Kasbī* (needs to be acquired). The reason being that it has the link of ‘following (Rasūlullāh ﷺ)’ in it. Therefore, it as though the claim has three parts to it; (A) *Zillī Burūzī Nubuwwat*, (B) it came after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, (C) it is *Kasbī* and not *Wahabī*.

Now, after these three clarifications, it needs to be seen if the proofs of the Mirzā’is conform to this specific claim of theirs? If they do not conform to the claim, then they should not be discussed, for example; if a proof is presented which does not make mention of *Zillī, Burūzī, Wahabī, Kasbī* and (it does not mention whether this *Nubuwwat* is) after (Rasūlullāh ﷺ) or before Rasūlullāh ﷺ, then it should not be considered. Generally the Qādiyānīs adopt this cunning method and they begin the discussion by presenting general verses. Inexperienced debaters do not realise this trick of theirs (the Qādiyānīs). Therefore, they (the Qādiyānīs) should be stopped at this very point – that the proof should be in full conformity with the claim. No specific claim can be established through a general proof. If you remain firm on this point, then it is our claim that *Inshā Allāh*

no Qādiyānī will be able to present a single proof for his specific imaginary belief until the day of *Qiyāmah*.

AN IMPORTANT NOTE

When they find no way out, the Mirzā's move away from this topic and begin the discussion of 'possibility of *Nubuwwat*'. Therefore, one should be wary at this point. This topic should not be discussed and it should be said that the matter here is not about 'possibility', but it is about 'occurrence'. If they still persist, then the following text of (the book) *Tiryāq-ul-Qulūb* should be read out to them. *Inshā Allāh*, this prescription will silence them quickly.

'One person who is a sweeper, who is serving the honourable Muslims of a certain village for thirty (30) to forty (40) years. He cleans the dirty gutters of their homes twice (in a daily) and he carries the filth of their excreta. He was caught stealing once. He was caught in the act of fornication a few times and he was disgraced. He also spent a few years in jail. The lambardars of the village have even beaten him up a number of times due to doing evil actions. His mother and grandmother would also do this filthy work. They would all eat carrion...and carry faeces. Now, when considering the power of Allāh ﷻ it is possible that this person repents from his actions and becomes a Muslim. Then, it is also possible that Allāh ﷻ favours him and he becomes a

Rasūl and Nabī, and he comes with the invitation (of Islām) to the noble people of the same village. He would say, whoever from amongst you disobeys me, Allāh ﷻ will throw him into *Jahannam*. However, despite this possibility, Allāh ﷻ has never done so since the world was created.”ⁱ

In actual reality Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has clarified his own reality in the above text. Therefore, even after the ‘possibility of *Nubuwwat*’, it is impossible to accept a person of unsound mind like Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī as a Nabī.

The proofs of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* (finality of *Nubuwwat*) are *Mutawātir* and evident like the bright day. For further clarification, one should study the books; ‘*Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*’ⁱⁱ, ‘*Aqīdat-ul-Ummah Fī Ma’nā Khatm-in-Nubuwwat*’ⁱⁱⁱ, ‘*Hidāyat-ul-Mutaharrī*’^{iv} etc. Here we will concentrate less on these proofs (the proofs on *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*) and we will concentrate largely on the refutation to the proofs of the Mirzā’is, because it is this that is mostly required during a debate.

ⁱ Tiryāq-ul-Qulūb p.152, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.15 pp.279-280

ⁱⁱ Authored by Muftī Muhammad Shafī’ ﷻ

ⁱⁱⁱ Authored by ‘Allāmah Khālid Mahmūd

^{iv} Authored by ‘Allāmah Khālid Mahmūd

INTRODUCTION TO KHATM-E-NUBUWWAT

Where the Noble Qur'ān has made the belief in the *Tawhīd* (oneness) of Allāh ﷻ and (the belief) in *Qiyāmah* a necessary part of our *īmān*, at the same time it has also made accepting the *Nubuwwat* and *Risālat* of the *Ambiyā'* and Rusul ﷺ a necessary part (of our *īmān*). It is necessary to believe in the *Nubuwwat* of all the *Ambiyā'* ﷺ just as it is necessary to believe in the *Tawhīd* (oneness) of Allāh ﷻ. However, if one has to look at the Noble Qur'ān from beginning to end, wherever humans have been asked to accept *Nubuwwat* and wherever it has been ordained that it is necessary to believe in a certain revelation (*wahī*), then one would find that mention is only made of the *Nubuwwat* and revelation (*wahī*) of the previous *Ambiyā'* ﷺ. No mention is made of any person receiving *Nubuwwat* and revelation (*wahī*) from Allāh ﷻ after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. There is even no indication or allusion towards it (in the Noble Qur'ān). If the objective was to bestow *Nubuwwat* to an individual after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, then there was a greater need mention it (in the Noble Qur'ān) as compared to (mentioning the *Nubuwwat* of) the previous *Ambiyā'* ﷺ. It would have been completely necessary to point it out. The reason being that the previous *Ambiyā'* ﷺ and their revelation (*wahī*) have already passed. The Muslim *Ummah* would not come into contact with them. However, certainly they would

have to come into contact with the *Nubuwwats* after Rasūlullāh ﷺ (if there were any). However, there is no mention of it (*Nubuwwat* after Rasūlullāh ﷺ) at all in the Noble Qur'ān. In fact, the Noble Qur'ān has made clear mention of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* (the finality of *Nubuwwat*). This is a clear proof that no person will be bestowed with *Nubuwwat* or *Risālat* after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Reflect on the following verses,

﴿وَالَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ وَيَأْتِيهِمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ﴾ البقرة: ٤

And those who believe in what has been revealed to you, [O Muhammad (ﷺ)], and what was revealed before you, and of the Hereafter they are certain [in faith]

﴿قُلْ يٰٓأَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ هَلْ تَنْقِمُونَ مِنَّا إِلَّا أَنْ ءَامَنَّا بِاللّٰهِ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْنَا وَمَا أُنْزِلَ مِنْ قَبْلُ﴾

المائدة: ٥٩

Say, "O People of the Scripture, do you resent us except [for the fact] that we have believed in Allāh and what was revealed to us and what was revealed before

﴿لَكِنَّ الرّٰسِخُوْنَ فِي الْعِلْمِ مِنْهُمْ وَالْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ يُؤْمِنُوْنَ بِمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ﴾

النساء: ١٦٢

But those firm in knowledge among them and the believers believe in what has been revealed to you, [O Muhammad], and what was revealed before you

﴿يٰٓأَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا ءَامِنُوا بِاللّٰهِ وَرَسُولِهِ ءَالَّذِي نَزَّلَ عَلٰى رَسُولِهِ ءَالْكِتٰبِ

الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ مِنْ قَبْلُ ﴿النساء: ١٣٦﴾

O you who have believed, believe in Allāh and His Messenger and the Book that He sent down upon His Messenger and the Scripture which He sent down before.

In the above verses Allāh ﷻ has only informed us of the books, inspirations and revelations (that came before Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Noble Qur’ān). And we have only been asked to believe in those *Ambiyā’* ﷺ who have passed before Rasūlullāh ﷺ. No mention is made of any Nabī that will come after (Rasūlullāh ﷺ).

We have only presented a few verses, otherwise there are many other such verses in the Noble Qur’ān. (The words) ‘before’ or ‘before you’ are clearly stated in the above verses. Now, analyse a few verses in which Allāh ﷻ has made mention of the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ using the past tense. This proves that those (individuals) who were going to attain *Nubuwwat*, they have already passed (before) and they have (already) attained *Nubuwwat*. Now, it is part of *īmān* to believe in them. Yes, there is no individual who will be bestowed with *Nubuwwat* after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. (Therefore,) it would not be a necessary part of *īmān* to believe in this individual.

﴿قُولُوا آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْنَا وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَىٰ إِبْرَاهِيمَ﴾ البقرة: ١٣٦

Say, [O believers], “We have believed in Allāh and what has been revealed to us and what has been revealed to

Ibrāhīm (ﷺ)”

﴿قُلْ ءَامَنَّا بِاللّٰهِ وَمَا أُنزِلَ عَلَيْنَا وَمَا أُنزِلَ عَلَىٰ إِبْرَاهِيمَ﴾ آل عمران: ٨٤

Say, “We have believed in Allāh and in what was revealed to us and what was revealed to Ibrāhīm (ﷺ)”

﴿إِنَّا أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْكَ كَمَا أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَىٰ نُوحٍ وَالتِّينِ مِن بَعْدِهِ وَأَوْحَيْنَا إِلَىٰ إِبْرَاهِيمَ

وَإِسْمَاعِيلَ﴾ النساء: ١٦٣

Indeed, We have revealed to you, [O Muhammad (ﷺ)], as We revealed to Nūh (ﷺ) and the messengers after him. And we revealed to Ibrāhīm (ﷺ) and Ismā’īl (ﷺ)

In these three verses and in other verses similar to them Allāh ﷻ has commanded us to believe in the previous *Ambiyā’* ﷺ and previous revelations. No mention is made of the *Nubuwwat* or *Risālat* of any person after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. It is clearly established from here that those personalities who were to be bestowed with *Nubuwwat* and *Risālat*, they have already passed (before). Now, a seal has been placed for *Nubuwwat* in the future. The path for *Nubuwwat* in the future has been closed forever. Now there can be no increase in the count of the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ. Besides the above verses, we present a verse that lifts the need of *Nubuwwat* after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. It shows a philosophy, by the conviction of which every believer attains contentment that no

person will attain *Nubuwwat* in the future, neither is there a need for it.

﴿الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتِمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا﴾ المائدة: ٣

This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favour upon you and have approved for you Islam as religion.

This command of Allāh ﷻ shows that all the beauties of Islām have come to completion. Now there is no need for any person to complete and perfect it. It is apparent that when there now remains no need for any person to complete and perfect (Islām), then certainly now there also remains no need to make any person a Nabī.

We now present the meaning of this verse in the words of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. He writes in his book *Tuhfah Golrawiyyah*ⁱ,

‘Similarly the verse *اليوم اكملت لكم دينكم* and (the verse) *و لكن رسول الله و خاتم النبيين* clearly (show) that *Nubuwwat* has terminated upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ. It has been stated in clear words that Rasūlullāh ﷺ is *Khātam-ul-Ambiyā’* (the last of the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ).’

The Noble Qur’ān indicates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ came after all the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ. All the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ came before

ⁱ Tuhfah Golrawiyyah p.51, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.17 p.74

Rasūlullāh ﷺ. No person will be bestowed with *Nubuwwat* after Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

﴿وَإِذْ أَخَذَ اللَّهُ مِيثَاقَ النَّبِيِّينَ لَمَآءَآتِيكُمْ مِنْ كِتَابٍ وَحِكْمَةٍ ثُمَّ جَاءَكُمْ رَسُولٌ مُصَدِّقٌ لِمَا مَعَكُمْ لَتُؤْمِنُنَّ بِهِءَ وَلَتَنْصُرُنَّهُ﴾ آل عمران: ٨١

And when Allāh took the covenant from the messengers, [saying], "Whatever I give you of the Scripture and wisdom and then there comes to you a messenger confirming what is with you, you [would have to] believe in him and support him."

It has been specified in this place that Rasūlullāh ﷺ will come after all the *Ambiyā'* ﷺ. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has quoted this verse in (his book) *Haqīqat-ul-Wahī*ⁱ. He then writes that in this verse (the words)

ثم جاءكم رسول ﷺ refer to Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

One should read the Noble Qur'ān from beginning to end. He would come to know that Allāh ﷻ commenced the chain of *Nubuwwat* with Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ and He completed it at Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The words of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī are,

‘After Sayyidunā Muhammad ﷺ the last of the messengers, I believe that any claimant to *Nubuwwat* and *Risālāt* is a non-believer and liar. It is my conviction that revelation commenced from Sayyidunā Ādam

ⁱ Haqīqat-ul-Wahī p.130-131, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.22 pp.133-134

Safiyyullāh and it completed at Muhammad Rasūlullāh

ﷺ.ⁱ

A FEW EXCUSES OF THE MIRZĀ'IS AND THE REPLIES

First Excuse:

The Mirzā'is say that due to a misunderstanding, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī rejected his own *Nubuwwat* and made a claim to being inspired (*Muhdathiyat*). In reality he was a Nabī, which he could not understand.

Answer:

The Mirzā'is should either say that when Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī rejected his own *Nubuwwat* and made a claim to being inspired only, then was Allāh ﷻ totally unaware of this action of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī or did Allāh ﷻ intentionally remain silent at this mistake of his (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) and did not stop him (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) from rejecting his own *Nubuwwat*. Can it be that in actual reality he was a Nabī and Allāh ﷻ also knew that he was a Nabī but Allāh ﷻ intentionally overlooked this lie, May Allāh ﷻ protect us? Does it befit the grandeur

ⁱ Majmū'ah Ishtihārāt vol.1 pp.230-231

of Allāh ﷻ? We would see the reply the disciples of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī give.

Second Excuse:

It is possible that some person says that in actual reality an inspired person (*Muhdath*) and Nabī is the same. It is as though an admission receiving inspiration (*Muhdathiyyat*) is an admission to *Nubuwwat*.

Answer:

Such a person should ponder over the text of *Izālat-ul-Awhām*ⁱ,

‘It is not a claim to *Nubuwwat*, but it is a claim to being inspired (*Muhdathiyyat*), which is made with the command of Allāh ﷻ.’

Now, this person should state if *Nubuwwat* and inspiration (*Muhdathiyyat*) is the same?

There are many texts which show that an inspired person (*Muhdath*) and a reformer (*Mujaddid*) is different from a Nabī *Ghayr Tashrī’i*. Being an inspired person is different from being a Nabī.

‘A Nabī will no longer come in this *Ummah*. Now if the deputies of the Nabī also do not come and show spiritual wonders from time to time, then the

ⁱ *Izālat-ul-Awhām* p.421, *Rūhānī Khazā’in* vol.3 p.320

spirituality of Islām will come to an end. In those times, *Ambiyā'* would come to confirm the *Dīn* of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ and now inspired persons come.ⁱ

There are many other similar texts in (the book) *Shahādat-ul-Qur'ān*.

According to the admission of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, after Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ many *Ghayr Tashrī'i Ambiyā'* came without books to conform to him. However, there are no *Ghayr Tashrī'i Ambiyā'* in this *Ummah*. Only reformers can come. Now, the question of *Tashrī'i* and *Ghayr Tashrī'i* no longer remains. After this necessary introduction and clarification, analyse a few verses on *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*.

THE BELIEF OF KHATM-E-NUBUWWAT IN THE LIGHT OF THE QUR'ĀN

First Verse:

﴿وَالَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ وَيَا آخِرَةَ هُمْ يُوقِنُونَ ﴿١﴾ أُولَٰئِكَ عَلَىٰ هُدًى مِنْ رَبِّهِمْ ۖ وَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ ﴿٢﴾﴾ البقرة: ٤ - ٥

And those who believe in what has been revealed to you, [O Muhammad ﷺ], and what was revealed before you, and of the Hereafter they are certain [in faith]

ⁱ *Shahādat-ul-Qur'ān* pp.59-60, *Rūhānī Khazā'in* vol.6 pp.355-356

*Those are upon [right] guidance from their Lord, and it is
those who are the successful*

This is a portion of the opening verses of *Sūrah Al-Baqarah*. These verses are found on the second page of the Noble Qur'ān. In these verses Allāh ﷻ mentions that to attain success and guidance it is necessary to believe in two revelations only, ما أنزل إليك (present revelation) and وما أنزل من قبلك (past revelation). In the sight of Allāh ﷻ if revelation was to continue after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, then certainly success and guidance would not have been restricted to present and past revelation only. In fact, it would have also been necessary to believe in the revelation that would come in future. An extra sentence, وما أنزل من بعدك, would have also been brought with these two sentences, just as the previous nations would be informed about the coming of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and a covenant would be taken from them that if that Nabī comes during your lifetime, then it would be necessary for you to believe in him and help him. We have searched the entire Noble Qur'ān, but we did not find the words وما أنزل من بعدك, whilst according to my knowledge the topic of وما أنزل من قبلك appears more than thirty (30) times in the Noble Qur'ān. Therefore, we come to know that Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the final Nabī and revelation has completely terminated after him. As a matter of expressing the favour (of Allāh ﷻ upon me), I would like to state that many Qādiyānīs repented from

Qādiyāniyat and accepted Islām at my hands when they heard my lecture on the about verse.

والحمد لله على ذلك

All praise is for Allāh for this

THE TRICKS OF MIRZĀ MAHMŪD

It was normal for the Mirzā's to become irritated at this proof. This is the reason that their second leader, Mirzā Mahmūd attempted to reply to it. He said that it is stated in this verse, *و بالآخرة هم يوقنون*, and (the word) *آخرة* refers to the promised revelation of our Hadrat Sāhib (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī). In this manner the third revelation is also included in the restriction made for guidance and success. It is also necessary to believe in it, just as it is (necessary) to believe in the Noble Qur'ān and the previous books. Mirzā Mahmūd made the translation, 'the promised speech which will come in the future'.ⁱ

THE HEIGHT OF IGNORANCE

A person with a little bit of acquaintance with the translation and commentary of the Noble Qur'ān would even understand that wherever the word *آخرة* appears in the Noble Qur'ān, then only one meaning has been

ⁱ Tafsīr Saghīr p.5

taken from it, i.e. ‘Qiyāmah’. Not one, but one hundred and fifteen (115) such examples can be presented. Therefore, it is sheer ignorance to take the meaning of ‘final revelation’ (from this word). Then, the word *wahī* is a masculine word and the word *آخرة* is feminine. Therefore, even according to the rules of syntax it (*آخرة*) cannot be an attribute of *wahī*.

Some unaware people incorrectly present the verse *بِالْآخِرَةِ هُمْ يَوقِنُونَ* to (try to) establish the *Nubuwwat* of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. They believe that *آخرة* refers to the final *Nubuwwat* (i.e. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī). However, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī himself understood that here (the word) *آخرة* refers to *Qiyāmah*. Check *Al-Hikam*ⁱ. In this book, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made the translation of *بِالْآخِرَةِ هُمْ يَوقِنُونَ* ‘and they have conviction in the hereafter’.ⁱⁱ

Second Verse:

﴿مَا كَانَ مُحَمَّدٌ أَبَا أَحَدٍ مِّن رِّجَالِكُمْ وَلَكِن رَّسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِيِّينَ وَكَانَ اللَّهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلِيمًا﴾ الأحزاب: ٤٠

Muhammad (ﷺ) is not the father of [any] one of your men, but [he is] the Messenger of Allāh and last of the messengers.

ⁱ Al-Hikam no.2 vol.10, 17 January 1906 C.E p.5 column no.2-3

ⁱⁱ Ibid, commentary of Sūrah Baqarah by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī p.11

THE TRANSLATION OF KHĀTAM-UN-
NABIYYĪN FROM RASŪLULLĀH ﷺ

أنا العاقب و العقب الذي ليس بعده نبي

*I am 'Āqīb, and 'Āqīb is the one after whom there is no
Nabī*

أنا خاتم النبيين لا نبي بعدي

*I am the last of the Ambiyā' (ﷺ). There is no Nabī after
me.*

THE TRANSLATION OF KHĀTAM-UN-
NABIYYĪN FROM MIRZĀ GHULĀM AHMAD
QĀDIYĀNĪ

﴿مَا كَانَ مُحَمَّدٌ أَبَا أَحَدٍ مِّن رِّجَالِكُمْ وَلَكِن رَّسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِيِّينَ وَكَانَ اللَّهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ
عَلِيمًا﴾ الأحزاب: ٤٠

*Muhammad ﷺ is not a father of any of your men, but he is
a Rasūl and he will be a completion to the Ambiyā'.*ⁱ

ما كان محمد أباً أحد من رجالكم ولكن رسول الله و خاتم النبيين ألا تعلم أن
الرب الرحيم المتفضل سمى نبينا صلى الله عليه و سلم خاتم الأنبياء بغير
إستثناء و فسرہ نبينا في قوله لا نبي بعدي ببيان واضح للطالبيين؟ ولو جوزنا
ظهور نبي بعد نبينا صلى الله عليه و سلم لجوزنا انفتاح باب وحي النبوة بعد
تغليقها وهذا خلف كما لا يخفى على المسلمين و كيف يجيء نبي بعد رسولنا

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām p.614, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.3 p.431

صلى الله عليه وسلم وقد انقطع الوحي بعد وفاته و ختم الله به النبيين؟

‘Do you not know that (our) Rabb, The Merciful, The One who showers favours has named our Nabī Khātām-ul-Ambiyā’ without making any exception. Our Nabī (ﷺ) has clearly explained it in his words, (there is no Nabī after me), for those who seek. If we term it as permissible for any Nabī to come after our Nabī (ﷺ), then we will be opening the doors of revelation (wahī) after they have closed. This is against the principle, just as it is not hidden from any Muslim. How can a Nabī come after our Rasūl (ﷺ), whilst (the reality is that) revelation (wahī) has terminated after his demise, and the chain of Ambiyā’ has been terminated upon him.’

This verse is an open declaration that Rasūlullāh (ﷺ) is the final messenger and he will terminate the chain of Nubuwwat and Risālat. Now, no new person will be bestowed with Nubuwwat after Rasūlullāh (ﷺ). Whomsoever was to receive Nubuwwat, he received this bounty before Rasūlullāh (ﷺ) (came). No person will receive this status after Rasūlullāh (ﷺ). Rasūlullāh (ﷺ) himself is the final (Nabī), his *sharī’ah* is also final and his *Dīn* is eternal. There is no room for any modification in it, neither is any change permissible.

CONFUSION OF THE MIRZĀ’ĪS

After making the claim to Nubuwwat, Mirzā Ghulām

Ahmad Qādiyānī lost his senses when he saw this verse. It became certain to him that as long as the verse is kept on its apparent meaning, then no person of understanding would accept any claim contrary to it. Therefore, not only did the false Nabī himself, but his entire following got into the effort of (trying to) defeat the objective of this verse. Accordingly, in order to reverse the belief of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*, which is clear from this verse, the Mirzā's made such weak, invalid and absurd interpretations, which no person in his right mind would even think of. We present below a complete analysis of some of their silly talk and tricks, so that Muslim debaters could benefit from it at the time of need.

THE MEANING OF KHĀTAM-UN-NABIYYĪN; SEAL OF THE MESSENGERS

THE BASELESS INTERPRETATION OF MIRZĀ

In the above verse, the belief of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* cannot be established from the word (*Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn*) because (the verse) means that (individuals will be made) *Ambiyā'* through the seal and affirmation of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. According to this meaning, it does not necessitate that Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the final Nabī. In fact, whenever a Nabī will come, then his *Nubuwwat* will be affirmed through the seal of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Mirzā

Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has himself written this meaning in his book *Haqīqat-ul-Wahī*.

Answer:

It is contrary to the other clarifications of the Noble Qur’ān, *Ahādīth Mutawātirah*, consensus of the *Ummah* and the rules of language to take the meaning of ‘seal of the messengers’ from the word *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn*. It is a rule of the Arabic language that when this word is attributed towards a group or nation, then it refers to the final person (of the group or nation). If the meaning of the Mirzā’īs is intended, then (the words) خاتم القوم and خاتم الاولاد would mean that the ‘nation’ and ‘children’ are made from his (so and so person’s) seal. Then, no commentator or reformer from amongst our pious predecessors took the meaning that the Mirzā’īs take. In fact, in the books of *Tafsīr* a commentary contrary to this is found. In *Tafsīr Ibn-Jarīr* the commentary of خاتم النبيين is narrated from Sayyidunā Qatādah رحمته الله,

عن قتادة ولكن رسول الله و خاتم النبيين اي آخرهمⁱⁱ

We also come to know from the *Qirā’at* of Sayyidunā Ibn Mas’ūd رحمته الله that the meaning of ‘seal’ and ‘one who affirms’ is not intended. In fact, the meaning is ‘final Nabī’ only. The words of the *Qirā’at* (of Sayyidunā Ibn

ⁱ *Haqīqat-ul-Wahī* p.27, 28, *Rūhānī Khazā’in* vol.22 pp.29-30

ⁱⁱ *Tafsīr Ibn-Jarīr* 22 p.11

Mas'ūd (ﷺ) are,

ولكن نبيا ختم النبيين

However he (ﷺ) is a Nabī who completed all the Ambiyā'

This *Qirā'at* is narrated in all the reliable books of *Tafsīr*. It has the status of *Tawātur*. In the presence of this *Qirā'at* there is no room for any doubt in this meaning of *khātām-un-nabiyyīn*.

THE MIRZĀ'IS SHOULD CHECK THEIR OWN HOUSE

In many of his writings, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has himself taken the word خاتم to mean final. Analyse a few references:

1. 'There are a number of names for the promised Messiah in the books of Allāh (ﷻ). From amongst them, one name is *Khatam-ul-Khulafā'*, i.e. a *khalīfah* who will come right at the end.'ⁱ
2. 'I have believed with my heart in His Rasūl and I know that all the *Nubuwwats* end on him. His *sharī'ah* is *Khātām-ush-Sharā'i'*'.ⁱⁱ
3. 'We believe with full conviction that the Noble

ⁱ Chashmah Ma'rifat, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.23 p. 333 on the footnotes

ⁱⁱ Chashmah Ma'rifat, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.23 p.340 on the footnotes

Qur'ān is *Khātām-Kutub-Samāwī*.ⁱ

4. 'He is the *Khātām-ul-Awliyā*' of this *Ummah*, just as Sayyiduna 'Īsā (ﷺ) is the *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā* from amongst the *Khulafā*' of the *Silsalah Mūsawiyah*.ⁱⁱ
5. 'And also the secret that in the end the name of the *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā*' of the *Banī Isrā'īl* is (Sayyidunā) 'Īsā (ﷺ) and the name of the *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā*' of Islām is (Sayyidunā) Ahmad (ﷺ) and (Sayyidunā) Muhammad (ﷺ).ⁱⁱⁱ
6. 'A girl was born with me. Her name was Jannat. She first came out from the womb and then I came out (after her). After me, no girl or boy was to my parents. I am the *Khātām-ul-Awlād* for them.'^{iv}

ختم شد بر نفس پاکش هر کمال
لا جرم شد ختم هر پیغمبری^v

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.3 p.170

ⁱⁱ Tuhfah Golrawiyah, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.17 p.127

ⁱⁱⁱ Addendum to Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah 5, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.21 p.412

^{iv} Tiryāqul-Qulūb, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.15 p.479

^v Preface to Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah p.10, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.1 p.19

*When perfection ended upon your pure being
Then Nubuwwat and all its types (which are from
perfection) also incumbently ended upon you*

هست او خیر المرسل خیر الانام
هر نبوت را برو شد اختتامⁱ

It is evident from these references that even according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī (the words) *Khātam-ul-Ambiyā*’, *Khātam-ul-Awliyā*’ and *Khātam-ul-Awlād* mean ‘final Nabī’, ‘final walī’ and ‘final child’.

DOES THE DESCENT OF SAYYIDUNĀ ‘ĪSĀ ﷺ NEGATE KHATM-E-NUBUWWAT?

Whilst criticising the verse on *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*, the Mirzā’is say that if Rāsūlullāh ﷺ is the final Nabī then how will Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ come before *Qiyāmah*? When he will come, he will be the final Nabī, not Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Therefore, it is established that either Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ passed away or Rasūlullāh ﷺ is not the final Nabī.

Answers:

This trick of the Mirzā’is can be answered to in a number of ways.

- a. The citation has just passed wherein Mirzā

ⁱ Sirāj Munīr p.93, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.12 p.95

Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has called himself *Khātām-ul-Awlād*. The commentary is, ‘No boy or girl was born after me’. We also say the same thing, that the meaning of *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn* is that now no new Nabī will be born after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Those who were born before Rasūlullāh ﷺ, they have already become Nabīs. This chain has come to an end after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Since Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام was born before Rasūlullāh ﷺ and he is alive in the heavens, therefore his presence and descent to the world close to *Qiyāmah*, it will not impact the finality of *Nubuwwat* of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

- b. By Rasūlullāh ﷺ being the final Nabī it does not necessitate that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام has passed away. Just as by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī being *Khātām-ul-Awlād* (the last child), this would establish the death of his elder brothers and sisters. Similarly Rasūlullāh ﷺ consoled Sayyidunā ‘Abbās عليه السلام (when he had the regret of not being from amongst the first persons who made *Hijrah*),

اطمئن يا عم فإنك خاتم المهاجرين في الهجرة كما أنا خاتم النبيين في
النبوة^١

^١ Kanz-ul-‘Ummāl vol.6 p.178

So can any person of intelligence make this deduction that by Sayyidunā ‘Abbās ؑ being *Khātām-ul-Muhājirīn*, all the other *Muhājirīn* passed away by him becoming *Khātām-ul-Muhājirīn*. In fact, the meaning is clear from the words of the Hadīth, that he is the last person to do the action of *Hijrah* just as Rasūlullāh ؐ is the last from those who received *Nubuwwat*. Being the final (Nabī) does not necessitate that the *Ambiyā’* ؑ before Rasūlullāh ؐ have (all) passed away.

- c. The meaning of *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn* is that no person will be made a Nabī after Rasūlullāh ؐ. As Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ؑ was made a Nabī before Rasūlullāh ؐ, therefore his descent does not negate the finality of *Nubuwwat* of Rasūlullāh ؐ. This is the explanation that the reliable commentators give for this verse. Accordingly, the author of *Kash-shāf* provides the answer to the doubt of the Qādiyānīs in the following words,

فان قلت كيف كان آخر الأنبياء و عيسى عليه السلام ينزل في آخر
الزمان؟ قلت معنى كونه آخر الأنبياء أنه لا ينبا أحد بعده وعيسى

نبي قبله^١

TRANSLATION OF THE TEXT OF KASH-SHĀF

If the objection is made that how can Rasūlullāh ﷺ be the final Nabī when Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ will descend in the final era? My answer would be, the meaning of Rasūlullāh ﷺ being the final Nabī is that no person will be made a Nabī after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. And Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is from amongst those persons who were made Nabīs before Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

This subject matter is also found in the other reliable books of Tafsīr.

IS RASŪLULLĀH ﷺ THE SEAL OF ONLY THE PREVIOUS AMBIYĀ’?

With regards to the verse on *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*, some Mirzā’is have played the trick that the meaning of *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn* is that Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the *Khātām* of all the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ who came before him. Therefore, for any Nabī to come after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, this would not be contrary to Rasūlullāh ﷺ being *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn*.

¹ Kash-shāf vol.3 p.239

WHAT SPECIALTY REMAINS?

Granted that the Mirzā's meaning of *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn* is taken, then every Nabī would be *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn*. The reason being that he would also be a *Khātām* of the *Ambiyā'* ﷺ before him, whilst the reality is that this title was bestowed to Rasūlullāh ﷺ only. No other Nabī was referred to as *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn*. Therefore, we come to know that this attribute is only for Rasūlullāh ﷺ. This attribute can only stand out when 'the final Nabī' is intended from it. Accordingly, Rasūlullāh ﷺ said that he has been given virtue over all the *Ambiyā'* ﷺ in certain things. From amongst them, two specialities are,

أرسلت إلى الخلق كافة و ختم بي النبيون¹

I have been sent as a Rasūl to all the creation and the chain of the Ambiyā' has been terminated upon me

Thus, the meaning stated by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is contrary to these clear *Nusūs*.

IS THE ALIF-LĀM ON KHĀTAM-UN-NABIYYĪN 'AHDĪ OR ISTIGHRĀQĪ?

The Mirzā's also say that the *Alif-Lām* in النبيين is not for all-inclusivity. Therefore, Rāsūlullāh ﷺ cannot be called

¹ Tirmidhī vol.2 p.283

the final Nabī. The *Alif-Lām* is ‘*Abdī*. The meaning is that Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the last from the *Ashāb Sharā’i’ Jadīdah* (*Tashrī’i Ambiyā’*). Therefore, for a *Ghayr Sāhib Sharī’ah Jadīdah Nabī* (Nabi without a new *sharī’ah*) to come after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, this will not be contrary to the verse.

RESPONSE

- a. There is no reliable commentator or reformer who has stated that the *Alif-Lām* here is for ‘*Abdī*. The meaning of all-inclusivity is correct here. Therefore, there is no need to take the figurative meaning, i.e. ‘*Abdī*.
- b. If it is accepted that the *Alif-Lām* is ‘*Abdī*, then the *Ma’būd*, i.e. the *Ambiyā’* ﷺ who received a new *sharī’ah*, has to be mentioned before it. This is not found anywhere in the Noble Qur’ān.

IS SAYING KHĀTAM-UN-NABIYYĪN THE SAME LIKE SAYING KHĀTAM-UL-MUFASSIRĪN & SIMILAR TITLES?

One of the baseless interpretations upon which the Mirzā’is boast about is that *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn* is used for Rasūlullāh ﷺ just as the words *Khātam-ul-Muhaddithīn* and *Khātam-ul-Mufasssīrīn* are used for some person. No person understands from these words

that no *Muhaddith* or *Mufassir* will be born after this person. In fact, these words are used as an exaggeration. In the same manner these words have been used for Rasūlullāh ﷺ as an exaggeration. Therefore, it would not be contrary to this if any Nabī comes after Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

WE SEEK THE PROTECTION OF ALLĀH

The reality is that this interpretation alone is sufficient for the *Takfīr* of the Mirzā'is. Just think a little, what is the level of the remarks of normal people, due to their unawareness, that so and so person is *Khātām-ul-Mufasssirīn* and what is the level of the classification by Allāh ﷻ that so and so messenger is *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn*? It is open foolishness to place both on the same level. It is a rejection Allāh ﷻ's knowledge of the unseen. The Mirzā'is and their Hadrat Sāhib (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) should keep this boldness of theirs to themselves, May Allāh ﷻ protect us. Then, a point worth reflecting upon is that attaining *Nubuwwat* is something *Wahabī* and becoming a *Muhaddith* or *Mufasssir* is something *Kasbī*. Therefore, when the One gifting *Nubuwwat* (Allāh ﷻ) says that so and so person is *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn*, then the meaning would only be that the chain of bestowing *Nubuwwat* has now terminated. This is different from *Khātām-ul-Mufasssirīn* etc, because the series of *Kasb* (acquisition) will

continue until *Qiyāmah*. In something *Kasbī*, no person can say that this specific person is the *Khātām* of it, neither does this thought pass the mind of any person when these words are used. Therefore, words like *Khātām-ul-Mufasssīrīn* are used for exaggeration.

THE PREY CAME OUT OF YOUR SHIELD

When the Mirzā'is do not stop this silly talk of theirs, then the texts of their Hadrat Sāhib (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī), which clearly indicate towards *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*, should be presented in front of them immediately. In fact, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has translated the verse under discussion exactly the same as us. This citation holds the power of an atom bomb in blowing away the proofs of the Mirzā'is. Analyse the translation of the verse as made by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī,

‘Muhammad ﷺ is not a father of any of your men, but he is a Rasūl and he will be a completion to the *Ambiyā'*.’ⁱ

This subject matter also appears with some detail in the other books of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī; *Nishān-Āsmānī*, *Ā'inah Kamālāt-Islām*, *Ayyām As-Sulh* and *Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā*.

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Awhām, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.3 p.431 verse 21

The Mirzā'is present a doubt here that these are the writings of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī before he received *Nubuwwat*. Later on in 1901 C.E his view changed. Therefore, all these writings are abrogated and not worthy of being presented as proof.

WHAT HAPPENED WHEN THE LIE DID NOT WORK?

The answer to this fictitious doubt is that abrogation does not occur in beliefs. Abrogation takes place in commands. It is impossible that something was *Kufr* before and later on it becomes part of Islām and *īmān*. Then, the Ambiyā' ﷺ are protected from sin before *Nubuwwat*, just as they are protected from sin after *Nubuwwat*. Granted that abrogation did take place, then either the belief before the abrogation or the belief after the abrogation would be correct. If the belief before the abrogation is believed to be correct, then Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī cannot be classified as a Nabī right until *Qiyāmah*. And if the belief after the abrogation i.e. the belief that *Nubuwwat* has not terminated, is believed to be correct, then it would necessitate the *Takfir* of the entire *Ummah* who believed before in *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*, and the person who calls the entire *Ummah* *Kāfir* would himself become a *Kāfir*. Therefore, in any case, the *Kufr* of the Mirzā'is is certain. One cannot ward off the affliction of *Kufr* with these superficial and

baseless doubts and objections, neither can the *Nubuwwat* of the Musaylamah of Punjab (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) be made to be accepted (in this way).

Third Verse:

﴿هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُ بِالْهُدَىٰ وَدِينِ الْحَقِّ لِيُظْهِرَهُ عَلَى الدِّينِ كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ﴾ الصف: ٩

*He is the One Who sent His Rasūl with guidance and
the true Dīn in order to prevail over every other Dīn,
even if the polytheists dislike it*

We come to know from this verse that the *Dīn* of Sayyidunā Muhammad ﷺ will prevail over all the other *Adyān* and its coming has abrogated all the other remaining *Adyān*. This supremacy can only be conceived when no Nabī would come after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The reason being that if a Nabī would come after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, then it would be necessary to follow him and it would not be sufficient to believe in Rasūlullāh ﷺ without believing in him. This would then be contrary to Rasūlullāh ﷺ being supreme.

Fourth Verse:

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ إِنَّا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ شَهِيدًا وَمُبَشِّرًا وَنَذِيرًا﴾ الأحزاب: ٤٥

*O Nabī (ﷺ), indeed We have sent you as a witness, a
bearer of glad tidings and a warner*

A few titles of Rasūlullāh ﷺ have been mentioned in

this verse,

1. Shāhid
2. Mubash-shir
3. Nadhīr
4. Dā'ī
5. Sirāj Mūnīr

Shāhid: A witness, i.e. Rasūlullāh ﷺ is a witness for Allāh ﷻ to His oneness and that there is no deity besides Him. Rasūlullāh ﷺ will also be the witness against the people on the day of *Qiyāmah*. The details (of this word) are also found in the following verses,

﴿فَكَيْفَ إِذَا جِئْنَا مِنْ كُلِّ أُمَّةٍ بِشَهِيدٍ وَجِئْنَا بِكَ عَلَى هَؤُلَاءِ شَهِيدًا﴾ النساء: ٤١
 ﴿وَكَذَلِكَ جَعَلْنَاكُمْ أُمَّةً وَسَطًا لِتَكُونُوا شُهَدَاءَ عَلَى النَّاسِ وَيَكُونَ الرَّسُولُ عَلَيْكُمْ شَهِيدًا﴾ البقرة: ١٤٣

Mubash-shir: The meaning of this word is to give glad tidings. Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the one who gives the believers glad tidings of great reward and *Jannah*.

Nadhīr: The linguistic meaning of *Dā'ī* is 'a warner'. Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the one who warns the non-believers from *Jahannam*.

Dā'ī Ila-llāh: Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the one who invites

the people towards the path of Allāh ﷻ with the command of Allāh ﷻ.

Sirāj Munīr: The *Nubuwwat* of Rasūlullāh ﷺ is clear as clear as the brightness of the sun. No one besides an opponent can refute it.ⁱ

NOTE

The word Sirāj indicates towards two meanings,

- (1) An oil lamp
- (2) The sun

In this verse the meaning of ‘sun’ is intended. In a number of other places in the Noble Qur’ān the word *Sirāj* is used for the sun.

﴿وَجَعَلَ الْقَمَرَ فِيهِنَّ نُورًا وَجَعَلَ الشَّمْسُ سِرَاجًا﴾ نوح: ١٦

﴿وَجَعَلْنَا سِرَاجًا وَهَّاجًا﴾ النبأ: ١٣

The question arises that why were the words سراجا منيرا used for Rasūlullāh ﷺ?

Shaykh-ul-Islām ‘Allāmah Shabbīr Ahmad ‘Uthmānī رحمه الله writes that Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the sun of *Nubuwwat* and guidance, the dawn of which made all other lights inessential. All the (other lights) have merged into this

ⁱ Tafsīr Ibn-Kathīr vol.3 p.498

great light.ⁱ

These couplets of Maulānā Qāsim Nānotwī ﷺ further clarify (the meaning of) this verse,

سب سے پہلے مشیت کے انوار سے نقش روئے محمد بنایا گیا
 پھر اسی نقش سے مانگ کر روشنی بزم کون و مکان کو سجایا گیا
 وہ محمد بھی احمد بھی محمود، حسن مطلق کا شاہد بھی مشہود بھی
 علم و حکمت میں وہ غیر محدود بھی، وہ ظاہر اایوں میں اٹھایا گیا

The verse stated above is a clear proof to the *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. There remains no room for any *Tashrīʿ*, *Ghayr Tashrīʿ*, *Zillī* (or) *Burūzī* Nabī after Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

REASONS FOR SIMILARITY

Hakīm-ul-Islām Maulānā Qārī Muhammad Tayyib Sāhib ﷺ mentions a few reasons for the similarity. We present them before the readers.

1. Just as the worldly life, the light of the universe, heat, the necessities of life and the growth of the trees, they are all dependent on sunlight, similarly the development of the soul, the heat of *īmān*, knowledge, character, recognition of Allāh ﷻ and the spiritual observations of the heart,

ⁱ Fawā'id 'Uthmāniyah (under this verse)

they are all only because of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

2. Just as it is necessary for the sun to have an axis upon which it rotates, and its axis is the sky, similarly the axis and central point for the spiritual sun is the sky of *Nubuwwat*.
3. When the sun is not out, then darkness spreads. Artificial light cannot remove the darkness. When it becomes very dark, then the stars come out. The entire sky begins to twinkle. A dim light covers the whole world. Then, when the sun rises, the darkness fades away completely.

In the exact same manner, when the darkness of oppression, ignorance, polytheism, carnal desires and doubts spread out in the world, then thousands of *Ambiyā'* ﷺ from Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ right upto Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ, they all arose like stars on the sky of *Nubuwwat*. However, thousands of stars together can still not change the night into day. Rasūlullāh ﷺ came on the sky of *Nubuwwat* to remove the darkness of the night. The darkness disappeared. Autumn changed into spring.

4. Just as there remains no need for the secondary light of the stars once the sun rises, similarly there remains no need for the light of any star of guidance (messenger) *after Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn*



5. Just as the sun comes out (right) in the end after all the stars, so that it can complete every previous deficiency of light, in the same manner *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā'* ﷺ was also made *Ākhir-ul-Ambiyā'* ﷺ so that his era can also be at the end of all the *Ambiyā'* ﷺ, so that the verdict of the final court can be the final word to all the verdicts of the previous courts and it can overrule (them).ⁱ

DISMISSAL OF A MIRZĀ'Ī DOUBT

The Mirzā'īs say that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī acquired munificence from Rasūlullāh ﷺ and got the rank of *Nubuwwat*. Therefore, by explaining the quality of 'sirāj', this doubt has been dismissed. By taking munificence from the sun, until today another sun has not been made. In the same way, by taking munificence from the 'sun of guidance', no one can become a Nabī. All other high ranks besides *Nubuwwat* can be attained. A person can become a *Mujaddid*, a *Walī*, a *Mubdath*, a *Qutb*, an *Abdāl*, even the rank of Imām Abū Hanīfah ؑ, but a person cannot become a Nabī.

ⁱ Taken from Āftāb Nubuwwat (Hakīm-ul-Islām Qārī Muhammad Tayyib ؑ)

﴿الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتِمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا فَمَنِ اضْطُرَّ فِي مَخْمَصَةٍ غَيْرَ مُتَجَانِفٍ لِإِثْمٍ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ رَحِيمٌ﴾ المائدة: ٣

This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favor upon you and have approved for you Islām as religion. But whoever is forced by severe hunger with no inclination to sin - then indeed, Allāh is Forgiving and Mercifulⁱ

This verse was revealed on the occasion of the Farewell Hajj, on the Day of ‘Arafah. Coincidentally, it was the Day of *Jumu’ah* too.ⁱⁱ






‘The crescent became full’ means that now there is no part of the moon left. The full has come to the fore. Whatever bounties have been decreed by Allāh ﷻ for man, all of them have come. His bounties upon man have been completed. Completion is the point after which no treasure remains. There is no place left even for a leaf. In this verse, ‘religion’ has been linked to the saḥābah ﷺ and bounty has been linked to Himself, i.e. *Nubuwwat* and *Risālat* are granted by Allāh ﷻ, the actions of man play no role in it.

The meaning of the completion of religion is that there is no need for any adjustments and new explanations of


ⁱ Sūrah Al-Mā’idah: 3


ⁱⁱ Tafsīr Khāzin vol.1 p.435

this religion until *Qiyāmah*. Every branch of life, covering beliefs, actions, character, trade, politics, social living and all other aspects of life have been clearly explained with all its principles and laws. It is perfect and until *Qiyāmah*, man does not need any new Nabī, any new religion or new form of guidance.

Hāfiz Ibn Kathīr  - accepted by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī as the *Mujaddid* of the sixth century – writes in his *Tafsīr*, ‘It is the great favour of Allāh  upon this *Ummah* that He completed the religion for them. Therefore, the *Ummah Muhammadiyyah* is not in need of any new religion nor do they need any new Nabī. It is for this reason that Allāh  made Rasūlullāh  as the *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā’*. Allāh  sent him to all human beings and all Jinn.’ⁱ

We learn the following points from this *Tafsīr*:

1. The religion is complete. There is no need for a new religion.
2. Rasūlullāh  is *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā’*. There is no need or scope at all for any *Tashrī’i*, *Ghayr Tashrī’i*, *Zillī* or *Burūzī Nabī*.

Sayyidunā Ibn ‘Abbās , the *Mufasssīr* of the Noble Qur’ān, says, ‘In the verse, “Today I have completed your

ⁱ Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr vol.2 p.12

religion for you', religion refers to Islām. Allāh ﷻ informed the believers and Rasūlullāh ﷺ that He has perfected faith for them. There is no need at all for any additions. The research and investigation has been done. It will not be decreased. Allāh ﷻ is pleased with it. Therefore, do not remain negligent of this.ⁱ

Imām Rāzī رحمه الله writes in his *Tafsīr*, 'Rasūlullāh ﷺ remained alive for approximately eighty-one (81) or eighty-two (82) days after this verse was revealed. There was no addition made to the *sharī'ah* in this time, nor was any ruling abrogated, nor was there any change made.'

He writes further, 'The above explanation is supported by the incident where it is mentioned that Rasūlullāh ﷺ recited this verse in front of the Sahābah رضي الله عنهم. They were very happy. They expressed their joy. However, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه started to cry. He was asked the reason for his crying, so he said, "This verse points out that the time of the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ is close. This is because after something is completed, there is only decline." This establishes the high level of knowledge of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. He drew this particular point from the verse which no one else did.'ⁱⁱ

ⁱ Ibid

ⁱⁱ Tafsīr Kabīr vol.11 p.142

If the meaning of the verse was not the completion of the religion, the completion of the bounty in terms of ending the revelation of required laws, the ending of revelation and the impending demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the crying of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه on this occasion would be in vain and out of place. In essence, this verse is a clear proof of the *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*. It supports the above mentioned *Tafsīr*. There is no scope whatsoever for any doubt.

Sixth Verse:

﴿وَإِذْ قَالَ عِيسَى ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ بَنِي إِسْرَءِيلَ إِنِّي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ إِلَيْكُمْ مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيَّ مِنَ التَّوْرَةِ وَمُبَشِّرًا بِرَسُولٍ يَأْتِي مِنْ بَعْدِي اسْمُهُ أَحْمَدُ فَلَمَّا جَاءَهُمْ بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ قَالُوا هَذَا سِحْرٌ مُبِينٌ﴾ الصف: ٦

When ‘Isā bin Maryam رضي الله عنه said, ‘O Banī Isrā’īl, indeed I am the Rasūl of Allāh to you, verifying that which came before me of the Taurāt and giving glad tidings of a Rasūl that will come after me, whose name is Ahmad’, when he came to them with clear proofs, they said, ‘This is clear magic’ⁱ

From this verse we learn that Sayyidunā ‘Isā رضي الله عنه addressed his nation and said, “I verify the Taurāt, all the heavenly scriptures and the *Ambiyā*’. I give you glad-tidings of a Nabī whose blessed name will be ‘Ahmad’. After Sayyidunā ‘Isā رضي الله عنه there was only one Nabī to

ⁱ Sūrah As-Saff: 6

come. It is clear that this Nabī was only Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Despite hundreds of changes made to the Injīl, we still find the glad-tidings mentioned in favour of Rasūlullāh ﷺ there. Study the following;

1. ‘All this I have spoken while still with you. But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you all things and will remind you of everything I have said to you.’ⁱ

2. ‘When the Advocate comes, whom I will send to you from the Father—the Spirit of truth who goes out from the Father—he will testify about me. And you also must testify, for you have been with me from the beginning.’ⁱⁱ

3. ‘But very truly I tell you, it is for your good that I am going away. Unless I go away, the Advocate will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you. When he comes, he will prove the world to be in the wrong about sin and righteousness and judgment: about sin, because people do not believe in me’ⁱⁱⁱ

The *Tafsīr* of this verse is clear from the Ahādīth, and texts of the *Mufasssīrīn*, besides the explanation given in the light of the texts from the *Injīl*. Subsequently, Hāfiz

ⁱ John 14:25-26

ⁱⁱ John 15:26-27

ⁱⁱⁱ John 16:7-9

Ibn Kathīr رحمہ اللہ writes, ‘The Taurāt has given glad-tidings of me. I am referred to by this news. I give glad-tidings to those who will come after me. That Rasūl is the unlettered Arab Nabī of Makkah. Therefore, Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام is the seal of the *Ambiyā’* of the *Banī Isrā’īl* and definitely he stands amongst the leading *Ambiyā’* of the *Banī Isrā’īl*. He gave glad-tidings of the coming of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and he is Ahmad, *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā’*. There is no *Nubuwwat* and *Risālat* after him.ⁱ

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, as recorded in Sahīh Muslim, “Indeed I have a number of names. I am Muhammad, I am Ahmad, I am Māhī – through which Allāh wipes out disbelief and I am Hāshir – the people will be gathered at my feet and I am ‘Āqib.”

In one narration, “I am ‘Āqib and ‘Āqib is he after whom there is no Nabī.”

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “I am the *du’ā* of my father Ibrāhīm and the result of the glad-tidings of ‘Īsā. My mother saw a dream when she was pregnant with me that a light came from her causing the palaces of Busra in Shām to become bright.”ⁱⁱ

From this brief and comprehensive discussion, it is clear

ⁱ Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr vol.4 p.359

ⁱⁱ Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr vol.4 p.360

that this particular verse is a clear proof of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*. The subject matter of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* is emphatically stated in it. The Qādiyānīs make interpolation in the meaning by taking it to refer to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and together with this, they show great insolence to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. All the *Mufasssirīn* support our explanation and stance.

The son of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī – Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn – says that the glad-tidings of the verse refer to his father. This is heresy (*ilbād*) and *zandaqah*. It also amounts to interpolation of the Noble Qur’ān. This is because the name of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is not Ahmad, it is Ghulām Ahmad. He claims to be Ghulām Ahmad (slave of Ahmad), not Ahmad. In fact, this goes against what his father had clearly said. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī said that in this verse, Ahmad refers to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, see *Arba’in* no.4 p.13 and *Rūbānī Khazā’in* vol.17 p.443. Now the Qādiyānīs can decide whether the father or the son is speaking the truth. One of them is definitely lying.

AN IMPORTANT NOTE

From the detail mentioned above, we also learn that Ahmad is the name of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, as the Hadīth quoted previously also states. Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “I am Muhammad, I am Ahmad”. He ﷺ then said that he is the manifestation of the glad-tidings given by Sayyidunā

‘Īsā ﷺ. Therefore, to say that the Qādiyānīs are Ahmadīs and to say that their religion is Ahmadiyyat is forbidden and it contradicts the Noble Qur’ān and Ahādīth. The Muslims name their children with names like Manzūr Ahmad, Shahbāz Ahmad, Ghulām Ahmad, Mushtāq Ahmad and so on. They attribute this to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, not to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

The person who takes Ahmad to refer to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and takes Ahmadiyyat to refer to Mirzā’iyyat, he is mixing the truth with falsehood. It is clear that this goes against the Noble Qur’ān. The demand of honour for *īmān* and the acquisition of the happiness of Rasūlullāh ﷺ is that we do not refer to the followers of this liar and fraud as Ahmadīs, but we should say *Mirzā’ī*, *Qādiyānī*, *Ghulāmī* and *Ghulmadī*.

Ghulām Ahmad is a *murakkab idāfi* word. When the *yā’ idāfat*, i.e. showing attribution, is added, then it will be *Ghulmadī*, not Ahmadī. An example of this is people of the ‘Abdul-Qays tribe who are called ‘*Abqasī*.

AHĀDĪTH ON KHATM-E-NUBUWWAT

Hadīth 1:

Sayyidunā Abū Hurayrah ﷺ narrates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “The political matters of the *Banī Isrā’īl* were handled by their *Ambiyā’*. Whenever a Nabī amongst them passed away, another Nabī would come in his

place. However, no Nabī will come after me, there will be *Khulafā'*, many of them.”ⁱ

This Hadīth has a very high grading in terms of the chain of narration as well as the text. It clearly states that there will be no type of Nabī after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Every form of *Nubuwwat* is negated. The words of the Hadīth teach us that in this *Ummah*, no Nabī can come that resembles the *Ambiyā'* of the *Banī Isrā'īl*, i.e. they were sent to lead the nation in political matters too. The doors of *Nubuwwat* are closed. There will be *Khulafā'*, just as after Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī there were *Khulafā'*.

FLABBERGASTED

This Hadīth caused great consternation amongst the Qādiyānīs. This is because they shamelessly resort to all sorts of useless interpretations for this Hadīth. Let us look at some of these interpretations and the responses to them.

1. The negation is not for the species, but it negates perfection, i.e. there will be no complete and perfect Nabī with a *sharī'ah* after him ﷺ.

ⁱ Sahīh Bukhārī vol.1 p.491, Sahīh Muslim vol.2 p.126

Response 1:

If an idol worshipper says that in the *Kalimah Tayyibah*, the negation is also for negation of perfection, i.e. there is no perfect and complete deity besides Allāh, but there can be a dependent deity. What answer will be given to this person? The answer that the Qādiyānīs give to the idol worshipper regarding the *Kalimah Tayyibah* is the same answer that we shall give regarding this Hadith, i.e. there is no Nabī after me.

Response 2:

Mirzā Qādiyānī has accepted that in this Hadīth, the negation is not of perfection, but the species is negated. He says, ‘Do you not know that the Merciful Rabb has named our Nabī as *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā*’ and there are no exclusions made. Rasūlullāh ﷺ has explained clearly that the meaning is that ‘there is no Nabī after me’. If the appearance of another Nabī after Rasūlullāh ﷺ is permitted, then it necessitates the permissibility of the opening of the doors of revelation after it has been closed. This is baseless and false, as is clearly known by the Muslims. In addition, why should a Nabī come after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, when after his demise revelation came to an end and the chain of messengers stopped.’ⁱ

In this text, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has

ⁱ Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.7 p.200

supported our belief fully. After this has been clarified, it does not give the opportunity to any Mirzā'ī to take a meaning that contradicts this one, otherwise the Nabī will either be lying, or his followers will be lying.

2. The meaning of 'there is no Nabī after me' is that as long as I am alive, there can be no opposite to me. It does not mean that no Nabī can ever come.

Response 1:

No commentator of Hadīth or *Mujaddid* has mentioned this condition that the Mirzā'ī claimant has. This condition has no proof and is fabricated.

Response 2:

'After me' means after 'my deputation', whether it is during the life of Rasūlullāh ﷺ or after his demise. Subsequently, false claimants of *Nubuwwat* arose during his lifetime.

3. Sayyidah Ayesha ؓ said, "Say '*Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn*' and do not say 'there is no Nabī after me'."ⁱ This shows that the Hadīth 'there is no Nabī after me' is not authentic, otherwise there is no need for her to negate.

Response 1:

This statement of Sayyidah Ayesha ؓ with an unknown

ⁱ Durr Manthūr vol.5 p.204

chain of narration is not a proof in the face of *marfū'* Ahādīth that are found in *Sahīh Bukhārī* and *Sahīh Muslim*. This Hadīth, i.e. 'there is no Nabī after me' is very authentic and Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has attested to its veracity. He said, "The Hadīth 'there is no Nabī after me' is so well known that no-one had any objection to its authenticity."

Response 2:

Even if we assume that the statement of Sayyidah Ayesha رضي الله عنها is authentic, the response will be that she said this in terms of the descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā عليه السلام so that no-one will be able to deny the belief of the descent of Sayyidunā 'Īsā عليه السلام due to misunderstanding. This is because it is necessary to protect the belief system of the masses. This is clearly stated in *Takmilah Majma' Al-Bihār* p.85. In addition, the purport of the statement of Sayyidah Ayesha رضي الله عنها is known through another narration of *Durr Manthūr*, where it states that a person said in front of Sayyidunā Mughīrah Ibn Shu'bah رضي الله عنه, "Salutations upon the *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā'*, there is no Nabī after him." Sayyidunā Mughīrah Ibn Shu'bah رضي الله عنه said, "It is sufficient for you to say *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā'*, there is no need to say 'there is no Nabī after him'. This is because the Hadīth is said to us that Sayyidunā 'Īsā عليه السلام will come. When he comes, then he will be before him عليه السلام and after him عليه السلام."

The meaning and purport of these words are clear. If a person says, ‘there is no Nabī after him’, then vagueness or confusion can be created that a Nabī that was deputed before, he cannot be present after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. This vagueness is not found in ‘*Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn*’. Therefore, when there is fear of confusion, one should suffice on *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn*, i.e. Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the final Nabī, this position will not be given to anyone after him ﷺ. In this there is no fear of confusion. In addition, there is a clear Hadīth narrated from Sayyidah Ayesha ؓ regarding *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*. Sayyidah Ayesha ؓ narrates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “No part of *Nubuwwat* will remain after me, except for glad-tidings.”ⁱ

Therefore, the statement of Sayyidah Ayesha ؓ cannot be weakened or stated as not authentic in any way.

Hadith 2:

Sayyidunā Jubayr Ibn Mut’im ؓ narrates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “I am ‘Āqib and ‘Āqib is he after whom there is no Nabī.”ⁱⁱ

This Hadīth also clearly shows the *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Ahādīth with a similar subject matter

ⁱ Kanz-ul-‘Ummāl vol.8 p.33

ⁱⁱ Tirmidhī vol.2 p.107

are also mentioned in the *Sahīhayn*.

Hadith 3:

Sayyidunā Thaubān رضي الله عنه narrates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “There will be thirty (30) liars in my Ummah. Each one of them will claim *Nubuwwat*, whereas I am *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn*.”ⁱ

DISMISSAL OF A DOUBT

The doubt can arise regarding the last Hadīth that there have been countless people since after Rasūlullāh ﷺ that have made claims to *Nubuwwat*, whereas the Hadīth only mentions thirty (30). Hāfiz Ibn Hajar رحمته الله says in *Fath-ul-Bārī*, “This Hadīth does not refer to the false claimants of *Nubuwwat* in general, because there have been countless such claimants. This is because in general, these claims will come from people that are insane or mentally instable. This Hadīth speaks about thirty (30) such liars that will gain power and will have many followers that will tread their religion.”ⁱⁱ

Hadīth 4:

Sayyidunā Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه narrates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “My example with the *Ambiyā’* before me is like

ⁱ Sunan Abū Dāwūd vol.2 p.224

ⁱⁱ Fath-ul-Bārī vol.14 p.343

that of a person that built a house. He made it very beautiful, but in one corner he left the place of one brick. People came in droves to see the house and were very happy. They said, “Why has this one brick not been put in its place?” I have filled that place and the palace of *Nubuwwat* has been completed with me and I am *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn*.”

This Hadīth has finished off all the lies of the Qādiyānīs. Rasūlullāh ﷺ has completed and perfected the palace of *Nubuwwat*. Now there remains no scope or place for any *Tashrīʿī* or *Ghayr Tashrīʿī Nubuwwat*.

Contrary to this, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has not only denied Rasūlullāh ﷺ being the final and perfect Nabī, but he has made claims of taking the place of being *Khātam* and perfect. See *Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* vol.5 p.113, *Rūhānī Khazāʿin* vol.21 p.144.

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī says, “There was a place for one brick in this building, so Allāh intended to complete this prophecy, to take it to completion with the last brick. Hence, I am that brick.”ⁱ

We seek the protection of Allāh ﷻ from this falsehood and fabrication.

ⁱ Khutbah Ilhāmiyyah pp.177-178, *Rūhānī Khazāʿin* vol.16 pp.177-178

Besides this, there are many other Ahādīth that speak of the *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat*. One should study *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat fil Hadīth* of Muftī Muhammad Shafī رحمہ اللہ and '*Aqīdat-ul-Ummat fi Ma'nā Khatm-un-Nubuwwat*'.

THE DECISIONS OF THE 'ULAMĀ' OF THE UMMAH ON KHATM-E-NUBUWWAT

It is the belief of the *Ummah* that denial of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* is *Kufr*, i.e. disbelief. This belief is agreed upon by all. Moreover, the person who believes that it is permitted for there to be some type of Nabī after Rasūlullāh ﷺ is definitely an outright disbeliever. One can gauge this from the following texts:

1. Ibn Hazm رحمہ اللہ writes in his famous work, *Al-Milal wan Nihal* vol.1 p.77, 'It is established that the presence or existence of *Nubuwwat* after Rasūlullāh ﷺ is baseless and false, it can never happen.'
2. Imām Ghazālī رحمہ اللہ writes in *Al-Iqtisād fi Al-I'tiqād* p.113, 'Indeed the *Ummah* has understood with consensus from '*Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn*' and 'there is no Nabī after me' as well as circumstantial evidence that after Rasūlullāh ﷺ there will be no Nabī or Rasūl until the end of time. No interpretation or specification will be of avail in this regard. The person who denies this will be a denier of consensus, i.e. *ijmā'*'.
3. Qādī 'Iyād رحمہ اللہ writes in *Ash-Shifā* p.247, 'The person

who claims the *Nubuwwat* of anyone with Rasūlullāh ﷺ or after him, or claims *Nubuwwat* for himself, or he claims to reach the rank of *Nubuwwat* due to purifying his heart and he feels that he can acquire this position through striving for it, or the person who claims that revelation of *Nubuwwat* comes to him although he does not clearly claim to be a Nabī – all these people are disbelievers and deniers of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. This is because Rasūlullāh ﷺ has informed that he is *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn* and there will be no Nabī after him.’

4. Shaykh ‘Abdul Wahhāb Sha’rānī رحمه الله mentions the statement of Shaykh Muhiyy-ud-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī رحمه الله, ‘Know well, Allāh ﷻ has closed the doors of *Nubuwwat* after Rasūlullāh ﷺ upon the creation.’ⁱ

5. Mullā ‘Alī Qārī رحمه الله writes in *Sharḥ Fiqh-ul-Akbar*, ‘Making a claim of *Nubuwwat* after Rasūlullāh ﷺ is blasphemy – according to consensus.’

Besides this, in almost every *Fiqh* and ‘*Aqīdah* Book, it is clearly stated that the ruling for the denier of *Nubuwwat* is a disbeliever. The Qādiyānīs spread lies and propaganda about some pious people and scholars. Bear in mind that all of this is baseless. Study the following books on this topic:

1. *Aqīdat-ul-Ummat fī Ma’na Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* by

ⁱ Al-Yawāqīt wal Jawāhir vol.2 p.71

‘Allāmah Khālīd Mahmūd

2. *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat wa Buzrugān-e-Ummat* by
Maulānā Lāl Husayn Akhtar

POST MORTEM OF THE MIRZĀ’IS PROOFS

FIRST PROOF

﴿يَبْنَىءْ أَدَمَ إِمَامًا يَنْتَكِرُ رُسُلُكُمْ يَقُصُّونَ عَلَيْكُمْ آيَاتِي فَمَنِ اتَّقَى وَأَصْلَحَ فَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ
يَحْزَنُونَ﴾ الأعراف: ٣٥

*O children of Ādam, if a Rasūl from amongst you has to
come who recites My verses to you, then whoever fears and
reforms, then there will be no fear and grief for themⁱ*

In this verse, all people are addressed, i.e. the entire humanity. They are told by means of a *mudāri*’ verb, i.e. a verb showing the present and future tense, which demands that this chain continues and a Rasūl comes continuously. If a person believes *Risālat* and *Nubuwwat* to end at a certain point, then the verse will be meaningless. This verse clearly shows that *Nubuwwat* continues.

Answers:

As is quite apparent, this extrapolation is very weak and

ⁱ Sūrah Al-A’rāf: 35

flimsy. However, in order to complete the proof against the Qādiyānīs and to give silencing responses to it when they use it, we shall give eight answers below.

Answer 1:

This proof is not in accordance to the claim made by the Qādiyānīs. Their claim is for specific *Nubuwwat* that a person gets through striving, whilst the proof they mention speaks about general *Risālat*. The Qādiyānīs accept that the verse is general. Subsequently, ‘*Ā’inah Kamālāt-e-Islām*’ states regarding the general implication of the word ‘Rasūl’, ‘The word ‘Rasūl’ is general. In this word, Rasūl, Nabī and *Muhdath* are included.’ⁱ

This principle, as accepted by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, states that taking a general word to mean something specific is nothing but nefarious.ⁱⁱ

If a Rasūl from amongst you has to come is general, whilst they believe in the continuity only of *Zillī Nubuwwat*. Indeed, this is atrocious from the Qādiyānīs.

The claim of the Qādiyānīs is specific and the proof is general. Therefore, this proof is not in harmony with the claim. Hence, it cannot stand as proof.

ⁱ ‘*Ā’inah Kamālāt-e-Islām*, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.5 p.322

ⁱⁱ *Nūr-ul-Qur’ān*, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.9 p.444

Answer 2:

The Qādiyānīs reply to all the verses that have the word ‘Rasūl’ or ‘Ar-Rusul’ and say that assuming that it is proven from these verses that after Rasūlullāh ﷺ a Rasūl came, then we say that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī says that the word ‘Rasūl’ is general. This is general for a *Tashrīʿi Nabī* and *Ghayr Tashrīʿi Nabī*. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī does not believe that a *Tashrīʿi Nabī* will come. According to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, this word includes ‘*Muhdath*’ and ‘*Mujaddid*’. He writes, ‘Rusul means *Mursal*, whether it is a Rasūl or *Muhdath*. This is because our master Rasūlullāh ﷺ is *Khātām-ul-Ambiyāʾ* and no Nabī can come after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Therefore, in this *sharīʿah*, the substitute of the Nabī has been kept as the *Muhdath*.’ⁱ

‘Rasūls means those people that have been sent by Allāh ﷻ, whether he is a Nabī or Rasūl or *Muhdath* or *Mujaddid*.’ⁱⁱ

Therefore, one answer for these verses is sufficient, that assuming that there is a Rasūl in this *Ummah* to come and the meaning of the verse is the interpolated one that you intend, then we believe that after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, there will be a *Mujaddid* and *Muhdath*, so where

ⁱ Shahādat-ul-Qurʾān p.27, Rūhānī Khazāʾin vol.6 p.323

ⁱⁱ Ayyām As-Sulh p.171

does the proof of *Risālat* come from?

Answer 3:

If the above verse is proof of the continuity of *Nubuwwat*, then one will have to accept that all three (3) types continue, i.e. *Tashrīʿī*, independent and *Zillī*. This is because the word ‘Rasūl’ is general. However, the Qādiyānīs believe that two types have come to an end. Therefore, according to their view, this verse is against us but it also goes against the Qādiyānī belief. Therefore, whatever response they give, we shall give the same.

Answer 4:

The verse says, ‘a Rasūl from amongst you’, not ‘a Rasūl from amongst us’. The subject matter is *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* and *Risālat* from Allāh. This is because *Risālat* in general means *Tablīgh*. In the second *rukūʿ* of *Sūrah Yāsīn*, the word Rusul comes for this meaning. It has come to show this in the Hadīth of Sayyidunā Muʿadh رضي الله عنه too. In this meaning, all the ‘*Ulamāʾ*’ and *Muballighīn* will also be Rusul. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī also accepts the word ‘Rusul’ as general. See *Muhammadiyah Pocket Book* pp.478-480. In this case, there is no problem in accepting the coming of Rasūls.

Answer 5:

If this was a proof of the continuity of *Nubuwwat*, then

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī should have given it to his deputy. The fact that he did not show it to his deputy indicates that that this verse cannot stand as proof.

Answer 6:

Assuming that this verse is accepted to be a proof of the continuity of *Nubuwwat*, then too, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī cannot be declared as a Nabī until the Day of *Qiyāmah* because according to his own words, he is not amongst the children of Ādam ﷺ. How is he addressed by the words ‘O children of Ādam’? He introduced himself by saying,

‘I am not a worm, nor am I a human, I am a man’s place of disgust and a shame to humanity’ (*Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah* from *Rūhānī Khazā’in* vol.21 p.127)

If he was from the children of Ādam, which we feel is the case until now, then he has spoken lies and denied that he is a human being. A liar cannot be a Nabī. If he is definitely not a human being, then his *Nubuwwat* cannot be proven from the verse. Therefore, it is a useless attempt by the Qādiyānīs to present this verse to show continuity of *Nubuwwat*.

INTERPRETATION OF THE POEM

In the above poem, the Qādiyānīs interpret it and say

that in essence, our Hadrat was very humble. Therefore, the objective of these lines was not to introduce him in reality. Hence, this poem should not fall under the topic of our discussion.

ANALYSIS OF THE INTERPRETATION

Firstly, no person of intelligence shows this type of humility where he negates his being a human and together with this refers to himself as the private parts of a person.

Secondly, a humble person will show his humility in every place and at all times. It is not that he excludes himself from being part of humanity at one moment and in another place he refers to himself as the greatest person amongst humankind. This type of crooked logic has been displayed by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī on many occasions. Let us see a few examples of his so-called humility for which the Mirzā'is present the above interpretation,

Abandon mention of Ibn Maryam

Better than him is Ghulām Ahmadⁱ

ⁱ Dāfi'-ul-Balā, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.18 p.240

Maulānā Muhammad Hayāt changed these lines to the following,

Abandon mention of Ibn Muljim

*The Garden of humanity that was incomplete until now
It all became perfect with my coming, including the leaves
and fruitⁱ*

Think, can such a proud and boastful person be called humble?

Answer 7:

If the continuation of *Nubuwwat* is proven from this verse, then we also have a verse that proves the continuation of the *sharī'ah*. Allāh ﷻ says,

﴿فَإِنَّمَا يَأْتِيَنَّكُمْ مِنِّي هُدًى فَمَن تَبِعَ هُدَايَ فَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ﴾
البقرة: ٣٨

*When guidance comes to you from Me, then whoever follows
My guidance, there will be no fear for him and he will not
grieve.ⁱⁱ*

According to the Mirzā'is, the continuation of the *sharī'ah* has also ended. So, whatever response they give to this verse, we shall present the verse they quote. If they say that the announcement has been made that the *sharī'ah* is complete through the verse, 'today I have perfected for you', so there is no need for a new *sharī'ah*,

Worse than him is Ghulām Ahmad

ⁱ Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah, Rūhānī Khazā'in vol.21 p.144

ⁱⁱ Sūrah Al-Baqarah: 38

so we will also be correct in saying that the verse ‘Muhammad is not the father of any of you’ teaches us that the building of *Nubuwwat* is complete. Therefore, there is now no need for any type of Nabī or Rasūl.

Answer 8:

The researched response to this proof is that when we look at the context of the verse, it becomes clear that no new ruling is being given to the *Ummah*, but something of the past is being related. Subsequently, in *Sūrah Al-A’rāf*, mention is made of the creation of Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ and Sayyidah Hawwa ﷺ. After this, mention is made of their living in *Jannah*, then the incident of coming down to earth is detailed. In all of this, it has been explained that after Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ came down to earth, his progeny was addressed by Allāh ﷻ. This address took place in the realm of the souls. Four verses of the Noble Qur’ān speak about this, *Sūrah Al-A’rāf*: 26, *Sūrah Al-A’rāf*: 27, *Sūrah Al-A’rāf*: 31, and *Sūrah Al-A’rāf*: 35.

In all four verses, the children of Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ are addressed. These verses do not address the *Ummah* of Muhammad ﷺ directly, but they speak about an incident of the past. Therefore, when we look at the method of the Noble Qur’ān, we understand that the *Ummat-e-Da’wat* are referred to by ‘O People’ and the *Ummat-e-Ijābat* are referred to by ‘O you who believe’.

Anyway, after mentioning this incident, the Noble Qur’ān mentions a number of *Ulul-‘Azam Ambiyā’* ﷺ. It is as though the explanation is given of the words ‘if a Rasūl from amongst you comes to you’ is continuing. After all of them are mentioned, mention is made of Sayyidunā Muhammad *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā’* ﷺ,

﴿الَّذِينَ يَتَّبِعُونَ الرَّسُولَ النَّبِيَّ الْأُمِّيَّ الَّذِي يَجِدُونَهُ مَكْتُوبًا عِنْدَهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ
وَإِنْجِيلٍ﴾ الأعراف: ١٥٧

Those who follow the Rasūl, the unlettered Nabī, whom they find written by them in the Taurāt and the Injīlⁱ

Then, the announcement is given upon the tongue of Rasūlullāh ﷺ,

﴿قُلْ يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنِّي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ إِلَيْكُمْ جَمِيعًا﴾ الأعراف: ١٥٨

Say, “O people, indeed I am the Rasūl of Allāh to you all”ⁱⁱ

Not only this, but this announcement has been made in a number of *Sūrah*s of the Noble Qur’ān. It has been emphasized in different ways so that no doubt remains about the fact that Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the final Rasūl and he brought the final *sharī’ah*. Some of these verses are, *Sūrah Sabā*: 28 and *Sūrah Al-Anbiyā’*: 107. With complete clarity, the announcement has been made,

ⁱ Sūrah Al-A’rāf: 157

ⁱⁱ Sūrah Al-A’rāf: 158

﴿مَا كَانَ مُحَمَّدٌ أَبَا أَحَدٍ مِّن رِّجَالِكُمْ وَلَكِن رَّسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِيِّينَ ۚ وَكَانَ اللَّهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلِيمًا﴾ الأحزاب: ٤٠

Muhammad ﷺ is not the father of any of you, but He is the Rasūl and the seal of the Ambiyā', and Allāh has knowledge of everythingⁱ

Then, this subject matter has been discussed with great importance in the blessed Ahādīth. This is because it was in the knowledge of Allāh ﷻ that a *Dajjāl* like Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī will come in this *Ummah* and he will cause the simpleton Muslims to become the fuel of *Jahannam*.

Subsequently, Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “Indeed *Nubuwwat* and *Risālat* have ended, there is no Nabī or Rasūl after me.”ⁱⁱ From this detail we learn that Allāh ﷻ promised to send Rasūls from amongst the children of Ādam. These *Ambiyā'* and Rusul were sent and the promise was fulfilled right until the period where the sun of guidance, i.e. Rasūlullāh ﷺ rose. After him, there remained no need for any Rasūl or any *sharī'ah*. He will be the Rasūl until *Qiyāmah*. The *sharī'ah* that he teaches will be practiced. The chain of Rusul and *Ambiyā'* ended upon him.

ⁱ Sūrah Al-Ahzāb: 40

ⁱⁱ Tirmidhī vol.2 p.51

CHALLENGE

If the chain of *Risālat* and *Nubuwwat* continued in the *Ummat-e-Ijābat* or *Ummat-e-Da'wat*, then the words 'O you who believe' and 'O people' speak about the arrival of the *Ambiyā'*. We challenge the Qādiyānīs to show us one place in the entire Noble Qur'ān where after the address of 'O you who believe' and 'O people', there is mention of the coming of Rusul. We shall give an award or prize if they can show this.

SECOND PROOF

﴿اللَّهُ يَصْطَفِي مِنَ الْمَلَائِكَةِ رُسُلًا وَمِنَ النَّاسِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ سَمِيعٌ بَصِيرٌ﴾ الحج: ٧٥

Allāh chooses His messengers from amongst the angels and from the people, indeed Allāh is hearing, Seeingⁱ

From this verse we learn that the chain of *Nubuwwat* and *Risālat* continues. This is because the verb used shows the present and future tense. We understand that Allāh ﷻ continues to select people and angels for His message.

ANSWERS

The answer to this extrapolation can be given in three ways:

ⁱ Sūrah Al-Hajj: 75

1. This proof is general, whilst the claim of the Mirzā'is is that a specific *Nubuwwat* continues. The proof is not in harmony with the claim. Therefore, the claim of the Mirzā'is cannot be established using this verse as proof. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had taken the meaning of Rasūl to be general.ⁱ

Taking a specific meaning from a general word is nothing but nefarious and evil. Subsequently, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī supports our view and writes, 'It is nothing but nefarious to take a general word to mean a specific and limited meaning.'ⁱⁱ

2. It has been mentioned before that the Mirzā'is believe in the continuation of *Zillī Nubuwwat* after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. In this verse, there is no such condition mentioned at all. Therefore, in terms of this, the proof is not in harmony with the claim.

3. The word in this verse (يُصْطَفَى) clearly indicates that the selection is by Allāh ﷻ, i.e. *Wahabī*. There is no question of getting it through striving. The *Nubuwwat* that the Mirzā'is speak about is earned through striving, i.e. *Kasbī*. Therefore, when looking at this point, the proof has nothing to do with the claim.

ⁱ Ayyām As-Sulh, Rūhānī Khazā' in footnote vol.14 p.419

ⁱⁱ Nūr-ul-Qur'ān, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.9 p.444

4. It is not correct that a *mudāri'* word refers to present and future at one and the same time. If it is used for present tense, it will not be for future tense. The discussion of *istimrār tajaddudī* is a separate matter.

THIRD PROOF

﴿وَمَنْ يُطِيعِ اللَّهَ وَالرَّسُولَ فَأُولَٰئِكَ مَعَ الَّذِينَ أَنْعَمَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِمْ مِنَ النَّبِيِّينَ وَالصِّدِّيقِينَ
وَالشُّهَدَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ وَحَسُنَ أُولَٰئِكَ رَفِيقًا﴾ النساء: ٦

And he who obeys Allāh and the Rasūl, they will be with those whom Allāh has favoured, from the Ambiyā', the truthful, the martyrs and the pious, and how good it is to be with themⁱ

METHOD OF EXTRAPOLATION

We learn from this verse that the *Ummah* of Rasūlullāh ﷺ can acquire *Nubuwwat* by obedience to him. Just as by obeying him, a person can become *Sālih*, *Shahīd* and *Siddīq*, in the same way, they can become a Nabī through obedience to him. This is what we claim, that *Nubuwwat* through obedience to him continues. This verse is proof of our claim. This is because through the obedience of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, three stages can be acquired. This is agreed upon by consensus. So we say

ⁱ Sūrah An-Nisā': 69

that the fourth stage can also be acquired, i.e. the stage of *Nubuwwat*. Hence, it will not be correct to say that the meaning of the verse is that Allāh and His Rasūl ﷺ will be with the four types of people that obey them and they will acquire closeness to them. In this case, ‘with’ will have the same meaning as used in (توفنا مع الأبرار).

RESPONSES

By presenting this proof, the Mirzā’is should not think that they have fired some great arrow and no-one will be able to break it. The reality is that in order to show that this proof has no reality, one answer from our side is sufficient. However, for the sake of further consolation, we want to present different answers from various angles in order to totally finish off the Mirzā’is, silencing them completely. Assuming that there is a sincere seeker of the truth amongst them, he will turn away from his false belief through these answers.

Answer 1:

The proof has been taken from a verse of the Noble Qur’ān. Therefore, the Mirzā’is must present the statement of a *Mufasssir* or *Mujaddid* in support of their extrapolation. Without this supporting statement, their extrapolation will be rejected.

Answer 2:

Assuming that this extrapolation is correct, then from it, one can conclude that every type of *Nubuwwat* continues from it. This is something that the Mirzā'is do not accept. Therefore, the proof is not in harmony with the claim and it falls flat.

Answer 3:

According to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and his followers, the letter *wāw* comes to show sequence. In accordance to this, the person who obeys Allāh ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ, he will first be a Nabī, then *Siddīq*, then *Shahīd* and then amongst the normal pious ones.

In terms of this, a Nabī will be every person that obeys Allāh ﷻ, even though he does not acquire the rank of *Siddīq*, *Shahīd* and *Sālih*. This is because of the principle of the Mirzā'is, that *wāw* comes to show sequence. They make a big noise about this principle, so in all probability, they will not deny its application here too.

Answer 4:

In the verse quoted above, there is no mention of reaching the ranks. Mention is only made of 'closeness' or 'companionship'. This purport is clearly understood from the reason for the revelation of the verse. On one occasion, the slave of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Sayyidunā Thaubān رضي الله عنه said, "O Rasūl of Allāh, on the day of *Qiyāmah*, you

will have a very high rank, and Allāh ﷻ alone knows where we will be. Is there any way that we can acquire the honour of seeing you? We cannot tolerate missing you for a little while in this world, so how will we live in the hereafter without seeing you?” This verse was revealed in response to these questions, stating that through obedience of Allāh ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ, one will get the closeness and companionship of the four ranks, i.e. *Nabī*, *Siddīq*, *Shahīd* and *Sālih*. We learn that this verse speaks about companionship, not ranks. When we say that a person can reach the rank of *Siddīq*, *Shahīd* and so on through obedience, but never *Nubuwwat*, then the proof for it is another clear verse of the Noble Qur’ān,

﴿وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الصَّادِقُونَ وَالشُّهَدَاءُ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ﴾ الحديد: ١٩

Those who believe in Allāh and His Rasūl, they are the truthful, the witnesses by their Rabbⁱ

In this verse, there is mention of ranks, not closeness and companionship. In the verse quoted before this, mention is made of companionship only. In this verse, ‘they are the truthful, the witnesses by their Rabb’ only speaks about ranks. Therefore, there is no mention of *Nubuwwat* here. No *Mufasssir* mentioned the same *Tafsīr* as the Mirzā’is. If they have the courage, they should

ⁱ Sūrah Al-Hadīd: 19

present the *Tafṣīr* of a reliable *Mufasssīr* (that is accepted by both parties) in support of their view. They shall be given an award if they can present it.

Answer 5:

In *Saḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Saḥīḥ Muslim*, there is a Hadīth that states, ‘A truthful and honest trader will be with the *Ambiyā*, *Siddiqīn*, *Shuhadā*’ and *Sālihīn*.’ⁱ

In the light of the proof given by the Mirzā’īs, every honest and truthful trader should be a Nabī. If a trader cannot become a Nabī only through trade, then an *Ummatī* also cannot become a Nabī through obedience to Allāh ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ.

Answer 6:

If, according to the Mirzā’īs, a person can get the rank of *Nubuwwat* through obedience, then our question is, is this rank real (*ḥaqīqī*) or *Zillī Burūzī*? If a person gets the *Zillī Burūzī* rank, as is the belief of the Mirzā’īs, then the ranks of *Shahīd*, *Siddīq* and *Sālih* should also be *Zillī Burūzī*, whereas there is no such a thing according to them. If the *Siddīq* rank is *ḥaqīqī*, then one will have to believe the same for *Nubuwwat*, whereas the Mirzā’īs do not accept that a person can get the rank of *Tashrīʿī* and independent *Nubuwwat*. Therefore, this

ⁱ Mishkāṭ vol.1 p.243

proof is not in harmony with the claim.

This differentiation has no proof. All four ranks should be the same. These four are either *haqīqī*, or *Zillī Burūzī*.

Answer 7:

The highest rank in the *Ummah* of Muhammad ﷺ is that of being a *Siddīq*. The rank of *Shahīd* and *Sālih* is lower than it. Therefore, through obedience to Allāh ﷻ and Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the highest status that a person can attain is one of these three. It can never be that an *Ummatī* can become a Nabī. This is because the Sahābah ﷺ, those who had the highest level of obedience to Allāh ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ, those who presented such an example of following *Nubuwwat* that no other group will be able to present until this world remains, they had acquired the perpetual happiness of Allāh ﷻ and the certificate to *Jannah* and according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, the reality of Muhammad ﷺ had been set in them, despite all of these virtues, these Sahābah ﷺ could not acquire the status of *Nubuwwat*. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ remained as *Siddīq*, despite his complete and total adherence to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ remained upon the status of *Muhdath* and *Shahīd* despite his unique justice. None of them became a *Zillī* or *Burūzī* Nabī. So, after them can a normal person in the *Ummah* make the

claim that he followed Rasūlullāh ﷺ to a greater degree than them and he became worthy of *Nubuwwat*? Even if some pious person makes this claim, then people will not think twice in dismissing him, whereas here, a disobedient person like Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, the sapling of the British, does he reach the rank of being a pious person, let alone a Nabī?

Answer 8:

If a person can gain the rank of *Nubuwwat* through obedience, then the question arises that why was this *Nubuwwat* not acquired by great Sahābah ﷺ like Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ and Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ? On the Day of *Qiyāmah*, will they not have the right to ask, ‘O Allāh, we followed You and Your Rasūl fully and we sacrificed everything in this cause, but you did not grant *Nubuwwat* to us? In addition, a person (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) who was the agent of Your enemy, i.e. the British, he was their spy, You gave this bounty to him. Is this the demand of Your justice?’ⁱ Every

ⁱ Study the following writing of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī about obedience to the English, ‘My religion, the one that I repeatedly show, is that Islām has two (2) parts. One is to obey Allāh ﷻ and the second is obedience to this government that has established peace, they have given us protection in their shade from the hands of the oppressors, that government is the British Government.’ – Shahādat-ul-Qur’ān, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.6 p.380

person can understand that Allāh ﷻ will never display injustice.

Answer 9:

On one side, the Qādiyānīs try to prove with the above mentioned proof that by means of obedience to the Rasūl, a person can reach the rank of *Nubuwwat*. On the other side, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī attests that by obedience, even to the level of *fanā fir Rasūl*, a person cannot get *Nubuwwat*. The most that a person can reach is the level of being *Muhdath*. A few quotations will be presented below proving this,

Reference 1:

‘When the condition of a person reaches this level (as mentioned above) then his matter goes beyond this world. He gets all guidance and high ranks in *Zillī* form; the guidance and high ranks given to the previous *Ambiyā’*. He becomes the deputy and heir of the previous *Ambiyā’*. Whatever reality was found in the *Ambiyā’* previously as *Mu’jizah*, these are found in him as *Karāmat*. The reality called *Ma’sūmiyyat* in the *Ambiyā’* is found in him as *Mahfūziyyat*. The reality called *Nubuwwat* in the *Ambiyā’* is shown in the form of *Muhdathiyyat* in him. The reality is the same, but because of a different strength and colour, the names are different. Therefore, indication is given in the words of Rasūlullāh ﷺ that a *Muhdath* is *Nabī bil Quwwah*. If

the doors of *Nubuwwat* were not closed, then each *Muhdath* has ability in his existence and he has the ability to become a Nabī. In terms of this strength and ability, it is permitted to refer to a *Muhdath* as Nabī.

العنب خمر نظرا على القوة والإستعداد ومثل هذا الحمل شائع متعارف في عبارات القوم وقد جرت المحاورات على ذلك كما لا يخفى على كل ذكي عالم مطلع على كتب الأدب والكلام والتصوف . (روحاني خزائن ٢٣٧/٥)

From this text, it is clear that *Zillī Nubuwwat* is *Muhdathiyat* in reality. By complete obedience, the *Zillī Nabī* that is created, he is *Muhdath* in essence. The *Muhdath* described here is based on his ability only, i.e. if the doors of *Nubuwwat* are not closed, he can become a Nabī, just like when a person uses the word ‘grape’ to refer to wine. This is based on the ability within the grape. However, it is clear that this does not mean that whatever is the ruling of wine, that is the ruling of the grape. The rulings for each one will be different and separate. Similarly, if the word ‘Nabī’ is used for a *Muhdath* in terms of his ability, the rulings will be different for each one. Denial of a Nabī is *Kufr* and denial of the *Nubuwwat* of a *Muhdath* is not *Kufr*. Whilst this is the case, the Qādiyānīs refer to those who deny Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī (the *Zillī Nabī*) as *Kāfir*! This is a strange contradiction. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī says one thing, and the Qādiyānīs say something else. The ignorant people say something

completely different from both of them. From this, we can gauge the falsehood and flimsiness of this belief.

Reference 2:

‘Our master is Rasūlullāh ﷺ, *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā*’. No Nabī can come after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. In this *sharī’ah*, the substitute of the Nabī is the stage of *Muhdath*.ⁱ

This text of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī also destroys the building of the Qādiyānīs. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is like that old woman described in the Noble Qur’ān who would knit and weave during the day and undo all her work in the evening.ⁱⁱ

On one side, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī classifies his proofs to be like the Himalaya Mountains and on the other side, we see him denying his own proofs.

Reference 3:

‘The *Zillī* presence of Sayyidunā ‘Umar ؓ is like the presence of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.’ⁱⁱⁱ

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī accepts that Sayyidunā ‘Umar ؓ was the *Zillī* existence of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, then too he was not called a Nabī. We learn that by following

ⁱ Shahādat-ul-Qur’ān p.28, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.6 p.323

ⁱⁱ Sūrah An-Nahl: 92

ⁱⁱⁱ Ayyām As-Sulh, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.14 p.265

the Nabī, the most that a person can get according to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is *Zillī* existence, but not *Nubuwwat*.

Reference 4:

‘Hundreds of people have passed in whom the reality of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was stamped and by Allāh, their name was Muhammad or Ahmad.’ⁱ

From this text we learn that although hundreds of people have passed who had the name Ahmad or Muhammad in *Zillī* terms, but still none of them became a Nabī, none of them claimed *Nubuwwat*, none of them had their own sect, and none of them referred to those who denied them as *Kāfirs* and out of the fold of Islām. So it is something strange that so many great followers of Rasūlullāh ﷺ were deprived of this bounty and they left this world, whilst Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī became the real Nabī together with being the *Zillī* Nabī.

Answer 10:

In the *Sīrah* books it is mentioned that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said the following words before his demise, ‘with the highest companions, with those whom You have favoured amongst the *Ambiyā*’, *Siddīqīn*, martyrs and

ⁱ Ā’ina Kamālāt-e-Islām, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.5 p.346

pious.’

The Qādiyānīs should tell us, does this mean that, we seek the protection of Allāh, he ﷺ was not a Nābī and by means of this *du’ā*, he was asking for *Nubuwwat*? In fact, by looking at the text, we understand that companionship is meant, not the high ranks.

Answer 11:

The verse that the Qādiyānīs have given as proof, at the end it is mentioned, ‘and they are excellent companions’. From this, we learn that the verse only speaks about companionship. In the same way, it does not show a person becoming a Nabī, *Siddīq*, *Shahīd* and so on.

Answer 12:

We say that ‘a person being with someone’ does not mean that he becomes that person himself. For example, ‘a person came with his family’. This does not mean that the person became his family. If, according to the Qādiyānīs, a person becomes those who he is with, then people will not only become *Ambiyā*’, they will become deities too.

In the Noble Qur’ān, Allāh ﷻ says, ‘indeed I am with you’. In another verse, ‘indeed Allāh is with us’ – in this case, did Nabī ﷺ, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ and Allāh ﷻ all become one?

In the verse, ‘Indeed Allāh is with the patient ones’, does Allāh ﷻ and the patient ones become one? In this way, like the Hindus believe, one will have to believe that there are millions of deities.

Answer 13:

The meaning that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has taken from this verse does not prove that those who obey Allāh ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ will become *Ambiyā’*, but he says that the meaning of the verse is that one should come into the company of the *Ambiyā’*, *Siddīqīn* and other high ranking people. See *Ā’inah Kamālāt-e-Islām* p.298

‘You recite the *du’ā* in the five daily *Salāh*, ‘guide us to the straight path’, i.e. O Allāh, show us the path of those whom You have favoured. Who are they? The Nabī, the *Siddīq*, the martyr and the pious. The summary of this *du’ā* is that if you find the time of any of these four groups, then adopt their company and acquire munificence from themⁱ

Answer 14:

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī made *du’ā* for the people of Makkah Mukarramah for Allāh ﷻ to bless them with the company of the *Ambiyā’*, *Rusul*, *Siddīqīn*

ⁱ Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.5 p.612

and pious. Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā p.96 states,

‘We ask him to enter you amongst the *Ambiyā’*, *Rusul*, *Siddiqīn*, martyrs and pious’

Now, does this *du’ā* mean that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is aksing for all the people of Makkah Mukarramah to become *Ambiyā’*? If this is the meaning understood, then it is as though Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is making *du’ā* for the people of Makkah Mukarramah to acquire *Nubuwwat* and definitely his *du’ā* will be accepted. This is because Allāh ﷻ promised Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī in his inspiration that every *du’ā* of his will be accepted. Hence, the people of Makkah Mukarramah will definitely be *Ambiyā’*.ⁱ

Note: From the above explanation it has been proven that according to Qādiyānī thought, all the scholars of Makkah Mukarramah have become *Ambiyā’*. The scholars of Makkah Mukarramah have issued *fatwā* of *kufr* on Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, will this *fatwā* not be a call from the heavens? Therefore, based on the testimony of the Qādiyānī sect, the *fatwā* of *kufr* of all the *Ambiyā’* of Makkah Mukarramah has come upon Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī. Due to this, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is the highest level *kāfir* because as a result of the *du’ā* he made, this *fatwā* will

ⁱ Review of Religions vol.3 April 1904

be that of the *Ambiyā'*, not that of a common person. Now, let us see if the Qādiyānī sect will practically implement this *fatwā* or not.

THE HEIGHT OF OBSTINACY

Despite an abundance of clear proofs, the Qādiyānīs remain firm upon their baseless proofs. They say that in the verse, 'whoever obeys Allāh and the Rasūl, they will be with...' the word (مع) has the meaning of (من). The meaning is that whoever will obey Allāh ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ, he will be amongst the favoured, not just be with them. An example of this is found in the Noble Qur'ān, (وتوفنا مع الأبرار أى من الأبرار), i.e. make us among the pious and grant us death.

Those who are negligent will be fooled when wool is pulled over their eyes, but those who study the proofs know that these things are nothing but a mirage. The post mortem of these fabricated interpretations is presented below:

a. In the Arabic language, one will not find anywhere the word (مع) being used in the meaning of (من). If it comes in the meaning of (من), then it would stop (من) being used with (مع), whereas in Arabic usage, it is established that (من) will come on (مع). The famous book on language, *Al-Misbāh Al-Munīr* states, (ودخول من نحو جئت من), (معه مع القوم). Therefore, we learn that (من) cannot come in

the meaning (مع), otherwise it will lead to a repetition of the same word.

b. If the meaning of (مع) is taken as (من), then what will the following verses mean

(i) (إن الله مع الصابرين)

(ii) (محمد رسول الله والذين معه)

Does this mean that, we seek the protection of Allāh ﷻ, Allāh ﷻ is a part of the patient ones? Alternatively, the Sahābah ﷺ are part of Rasūlullāh ﷺ?

(iii) (إني معكم)

(iv) (إن الله معنا)

Do the above verses mean that Allāh ﷻ and the angels, and in the second verse, Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ and Allāh ﷻ all became one?

c. When one word has a few meanings and it is used for them, then it will be seen which meaning is the *haqīqī* one and which is the *majāz*. As long as one is able to practice on the *haqīqī* meaning, it will not be correct to take the *majāz*. In this case, (مع) has the *haqīqī* meaning of companionship and it is possible to implement and take it. This is because the next sentence, ‘and excellent company they are’ clearly supports the meaning of companionship. Therefore, it will never be permitted to take the *majāzī* meaning.

d. Assuming that we accept the word (م) to be used in the meaning of (م), how does this necessitate that here too (م) has the meaning of (م)? Has any *Mufasssir* or *Mujaddid* taken the meaning of (م) as (م)?

e. The verses that Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī uses to show that (م) has the meaning of (م) are such that not a single one of them shows this. The *Mufasssir* that we and the Qādiyānīs agree upon is Imām Rāzī ر. When he gives the explanation of ‘and grant us death amongst the pious’, it seems as though the rug has been pulled from under the feet of the Qādiyānīs. All their weak interpretations are blown away. He ر says, ‘Death with them, i.e. the pious will be such that they will pass away whilst doing the good deeds that they do so that on the Day of *Qiyāmah*, they will acquire their rank. Like a person says, ‘I am with Shāfi’ī ر in this ruling’. This means that in belief and conviction, he is equal to Imām Shāfi’ī ر.’ (Not that he has reached the rank of Imām Shāfi’ī ر).ⁱ

Imām Rāzī ر says in the *Tafsīr* of the verse, ‘and whoever obeys Allāh and His Rasūl...’, ‘It is known that being together with them does not mean that they will have the same rank as them, as this is impossible.’ⁱⁱ

ⁱ Tafsīr Kabīr vol.3 p.181

ⁱⁱ Ibid vol.3 p.379

According to the Qādiyānīs, Imām Rāzī رحمته الله is the *Mujaddid* of the sixth century. Probably he got inspired and came to know that the Qādiyānīs will make the wrong interpretation of this verse. Therefore, eight hundred (800) years ago, he clarified the verse and showed that the interpretation of the Qādiyānīs is worthless. All praise is for Allāh.

COMPLETE LIES

In obstinacy, a person will sometimes resort to shamelessness. One can gauge this from the deeds of the Qādiyānīs. In order to support their baseless extrapolation, they prepared a pile of lies and have tried to use the name of the famous scholar, Imām Rāghib Isfahānī رحمته الله for their nefarious plot. They said that from a text of Imām Rāghib Isfahānī رحمته الله, their explanation is supported. The text is,

قال الراغب : ممن أنعم عليهم من الفرق الأربع في المنزلة والثواب النبي بالنبي
والصديق بالصديق والشهيد بالشهيد والصالح بالصالح وأجاز الراغب أن
يتعلق من النبيين بقوله ومن يطع الله والرسول أى من النبيين ومن بعدهم .
البحر المحيط

From this research we learn that (من النبيين) is not from (أنعم) (الله عليهم), but it is linked to (ومن يطع الله ...). Therefore, the meaning of the verse will be that the *Ambiyā'* and the others that obey Allāh ﷻ and the Rasūl, they will be

with the favoured ones. In this verse, the *mudāri'* verb, i.e. showing present and future tense has been used. Therefore, even in this *Ummah* there should be some *Ambiyā'* that obey the Rasūl. If the doors of *Nubuwwat* are closed, then according to this verse, which Nabī is there that will obey Rasūlullāh ﷺ?

DECEPTION

The Qādiyānīs present the above-quoted text and thereby resort to great deception. The text has been taken from the Tafsīr *Al-Bahr Al-Muhīt*. However, they quote it and then mention their own opinion,

وهذا الوجه الذي هو عنده ظاهر فاسد من جهة المعنى ومن جهة النحو .
البحر المحيط ٢٨٧ / ٣

Therefore, we learn that this statement is totally rejected and one cannot extrapolate from it at all. Secondly, we do not find such a text in any book of Imām Rāghib رحمه الله. Therefore, it is wrong to attribute this statement to him. We have two reasons to support our stance on this matter, i.e. it is wrong to attribute this statement to Imām Rāghib رحمه الله,

FIRST REASON

Imām Rāghib Isfahānī رحمه الله has written a separate booklet on the Tafsīr of the verse. The name of it is *Ad-Darī'ah*

ilā Makārim Ash-Sharī'ah. Assuming that the stance of Imām Rāghib رحمہ اللہ is the one mentioned in *Al-Bahr Al-Muhīt*, then he would have definitely mentioned it in this book. However, in the entire work, there is not even an indication towards this. Therefore, attributing the statement in question to him will be wrong.

SECOND REASON

If there was any text of Imām Rāghib رحمہ اللہ in any of his books, then the Qādiyānīs should present it with the reference so that the proof can be strengthened. However, they take a text from *Al-Bahr Al-Muhīt* and continue howling about it because there is no original source for it. (I came to know of this in 1954, whilst debating a Qādiyānī by the name of Qādī Nadhīr – Maulānā Manzūr Ahmad Chiniotī). If this text was in any book of Imām Rāghib رحمہ اللہ, they would have presented it. They would have saved themselves the disgrace of altering the text from the book of 'Allāmah Andalūsī.

FOURTH PROOF

The Qādiyānīs take the verse, '*And Allāh promises those who believe amongst you and do good deeds that He will make them vicegerents in the earth as He made those before*' and say that in this *Ummah*, *Khulafā'* will be established, just as there were *Khulafā'* in the previous nations. In

the previous nations, like with Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ, Sayyidunā Sulaymān ﷺ and Sayyidunā Dāwūd ﷺ, the divine *Khilāfat* was given in terms of *Nubuwwat*. Therefore, for complete similarity to happen, there must be *Khulafā' Ambiyā'* in this *Ummah*.

RESPONSE

If your senior, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī does not take the meaning of *Ambiyā'* from the word *Khulafā'*, then he takes the meaning of *Khulafā'* to include Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ, Sayyidunā 'Umar ﷺ, Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ﷺ and Sayyidunā 'Alī ﷺ. These will always be *Khulafā'* in the *Ummah*, not like you, who say that it only means a Nabī in this *Ummah* that did not come before Mirzā. See, in *Shahādat-ul-Qur'ān* p.37, the following is written under this verse, 'This is because in reality, *Khalīfah* is the *Zill* of the Rasūl. The person who believes in *Khilāfat* for thirty (30) years, out of his ignorance, he will overlook the basic reason for *Khilāfat*.'

Going ahead, on pp.59-60, he writes, 'The Nabī has to come in this *Ummah*. Now, if the *Khulafā'* of the Nabī do not come, and they do not spread the different aspects of a spiritual life, then the spirituality of Islām will be finished.'

The text of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī shows that

the word *Khulafā'* does not mean '*Nabī*', but it refers to representatives of the *Ambiyā'* that will not be *Ambiyā'*. This is because in this *Ummah*, a *Nabī* cannot come, but *Khulafā'* will come.

NUBUWWAT IS WAHABĪ; NOT KASBĪ (CONFESSION OF MIRZA QĀDIYĀNĪ)

1. 'There is no doubt that divine revelation is only granted by Allāh ﷻ, one cannot acquire it through effort or striving, as is the case with *Nubuwwat*, i.e. just as one cannot acquire the status of *Nubuwwat* through effort and striving, in the same way, one cannot acquire the status of *Muhdath*).ⁱ
2. 'A complete believer is he who is given this bounty by the divine.'ⁱⁱ
3. 'Therefore, only through the grace of Allāh, not through any work, did I get a complete share of this bounty. This bounty was given to me just as it was given to the previous *Ambiyā'*, *Rasūls* and chosen servants of Allāh'ⁱⁱⁱ
4. 'The summary of the matter is that the thing that

ⁱ Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā p.82, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.7 p.301

ⁱⁱ Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.22 p.643

ⁱⁱⁱ Haqīqat-ul-Wahī p.62, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.22 p.64

causes divine revelation is the mercy and beneficence of Allāh ﷻ, the work of a person does not play a role in this. This is a solid truth. Those we address are unaware of this.”ⁱ

IS NUBUWWAT WAHABĪ OR KASBĪ?

We ask the Qādiyānīs, tell us, does a person get *Nubuwwat* through striving or is it granted by Allāh ﷻ? If you believe that it is *Wahabī*, i.e. granted by Allāh ﷻ, then your extrapolation is useless. This is because the ‘*Nubuwwat*’ earned through striving and acts of obedience is *Kasbī*. If you believe that it is *Kasbī*, then this is baseless and complete falsehood that has been agreed upon by consensus. If you say that it is *Wahabī*, but there is some part of *Kasb* in it, as Allāh ﷻ says, (يَهَبُ (لَمَنْ يَشَاءُ إِنَّا ثَمَرَاتُ

The verse that you have presented, we do not accept or believe there to be any form of *Kasb* involved. Granting children is the work of Allāh ﷻ only, a person has no part to play in it. If Allāh ﷻ wants, he can deprive a couple from children despite them having being married and having conjugal relations. If Allāh ﷻ wants, He can grant children without means, like the case of Sayyidah

ⁱ Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah p.312, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.1 p.398

Maryam ﷺ.

Therefore, the extrapolation they have done from the verse is useless. In short, if a person believes that *Nubuwwat* can be acquired through any form of earning and striving (as is the belief of Mirzā), then this belief will negate the ‘*ismat* of the *Ambiyā*’. There are two very important references concerning this point that must be remembered:

1. ‘Allāmah Sha’rānī ﷺ says in *Al-Yawāqīt wal Jawāhir* vol.1 pp.164-165,

‘Is *Nubuwwat Kasbī* or *Wahabī*? The answer is, ‘*Nubuwwat* is not *Kasbī*, where a person can reach its rank through effort and striving, like some fools believe. The *Mālikiyyah* have issued *fatwā* of *Kufr* on those who say that *Nubuwwat* is *Kasbī*.’

2. Qādī ‘Iyād ﷺ writes in *Ash-Shifā*’ vol.2 pp.246-247,

‘In the presence of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, or after his demise, whoever says that someone else is a Nabī, or he claims that he is a Nabī, or, he says that a person can acquire *Nubuwwat* through cleansing of his heart, or he says that he gets revelation, despite not claiming *Nubuwwat*, all of these people belie the words of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, [I am the seal of the *Ambiyā*] and are disbelievers.’

From these references, it is clear that having the belief that *Nubuwwat* is *Kasbī* holds the denial of Allāh ﷻ and

His Rasūl ﷺ in it and according to the *Mālikiyyah* and other scholars; such a person is a *Kāfir*.

OBJECTIONS UPON ‘THERE IS NO NABĪ AFTER ME’

Objection 1:

The purport of ‘There is no Nabī after me’ is that after me, there will be Nabī that has a new *sharī’ah*, as is clear from the texts of some scholars. If this sentence had a general negative meaning, then Rasūlullāh ﷺ would not have informed about the coming of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام.

Answer 1:

الا تعلم أن الرب الرحيم المتفضل سمى نبينا صلى الله عليه وسلم خاتم النبيين
بغير استثناء وفسره نبينا صلى الله عليه وسلم في قوله لا نبي بعدي ببيان واضح
للطالين ولو جوزنا ظهور نبي بعد نبينا صلى الله عليه وسلم لجوزنا إنفتاح
باب وحى النبوة بعد تغليقها وهذا خلف كما لا يخفى على المسلمين وكيف
يجيء نبي بعد نبينا صلى الله عليه وسلم وقد انقطع الوحي بعد وفاته وختم الله
به النبيين . حماسة البشرى ص ٢٠

In the above text, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī takes the meaning of ‘*Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn*’ and ‘There is no Nabī after me’ to be the same as that which we take and explain.

As for the objection regarding Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ, the answer has passed, that there will arise no difference if he comes, because he got *Nubuwwat* from before and by his coming again, there will be no addition made to the list of *Ambiyā’*.

Answer 2:

Just as in the words (لا إله إلا الله), there is no *Zillī Burūzī* deity, in the same way, after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, there is no scope for any *Zillī Burūzī Nabī*.

Objection 2:

Sayyidah Ayesha ؓ said, “Say ‘*Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn*’ and do not say ‘there is no Nabī after me’.”ⁱ

Sayyidah Ayesha ؓ said this whilst considering the descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ. Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ is a Nabī, but his time was before the time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. He is not a Nabī after Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The following explanation is mentioned with this report, “This is in consideration for the descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ.’

‘Allāmah Zamakhsharī writes,

فان قلت كيف كان آخر الأنبياء وعيسى ينزل في آخر الزمان قلت معنى كونه
(آخر الأنبياء أنه لا ينبا أحد بعده وعيسى ممن نبي قبله . تفسير كشاف

ⁱ Majma’-ul-Bihār

Answer 2:

If Umm-ul-Mu'minīn Sayyidah Ayesha رضي الله عنها was opposed to the Islāmic understanding and purport of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* and she supported the Qādiyānī understanding, she would have never narrated the following,

Sayyidah Ayesha رضي الله عنها narrates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “After me, no part of *Nubuwwat* will remain except for glad-tidings.” The Sahābah رضي الله عنهم said, “O Rasūl of Allāh, what are glad-tidings?” He said, “Good dreams that a Muslim sees, or someone sees for him.”ⁱ

“I am *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn* and my *Masjid* is the *Khātam* of the *Masājid* of the *Ambiyā'*.”ⁱⁱ

Sayyidah Ayesha رضي الله عنها reports that she said, “O Rasūl of Allāh, I feel that I shall remain alive after you. Will you permit that I be buried at your side?” Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “How can you be buried in that place? That is the place for my grave and the graves of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā ‘Īsā عليه السلام.”ⁱⁱⁱ

Sayyidah Ayesha رضي الله عنها said whilst mentioning the signs of *Dajjāl*, “Until *Dajjāl* will come to *Bāb Ludd* in Palestine.

ⁱ Kanz-ul-‘Ummāl

ⁱⁱ Ibid

ⁱⁱⁱ Ibn ‘Asākir, Kanz-ul-‘Ummāl vol.7 p.268

Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ will descend and kill *Dajjāl*. Then Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ will rule in the world as a just and equitable ruler for forty (40) years.”ⁱ

This is the height of the falsehood of the Qādiyānīs. Instead of trying to make their view in line with the Noble Qur’ān and Hadīth, they try to make the Noble Qur’ān and Hadīth fit their views. In this attempt, they do not refrain from lying against the pious predecessors, including Sayyidah Ayesha رضي الله عنها.

Objection 3:

In the words, ‘there is no Nabī after me’, the word (بعدي) comes to show difference, as in the verse of *Sūrah Al-Jāthiya*, (فبأى حديث بعد الله وآياته يؤمنون).

The purport of the verse is that what will they believe in that goes against the verses of Allāh ﷻ. In the same way, ‘there is no Nabī after me’ means that, there can be no Nabī aside from me, or someone that will go against me. A Hadīth says,

فأولتهما كذا بين ليخرجان بعدي أحدهما العنسي والآخر مسيلمة. (كتاب
المغازي، صحيح البخاري)

This Hadīth means that there will be two liars after me, i.e. they will come out in opposition to me.

ⁱ Musnad Ahmad vol.6 p.75, Ad-Durr Al-Manthūr vol.2 p.242

Answer 1:

Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī translated the words ‘*lā Nabī ba’dī*’ in the same way as the Muslims do, i.e. ‘there will be no Nabī after me.’

Rasūlullāh ﷺ repeatedly said that there will be no Nabī after him. The Hadīth ‘there is no Nabī after me’ is so well-known that no one doubts its authenticity. The words of the Noble Qur’ān are emphatic; they state (ولكن (رسول الله وخاتم النبيين). This verifies that *Nubuwwat* has ended upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ.ⁱ

Answer 2:

The translation of ‘*ba’d*’ as ‘opposed’ or ‘opposition’ is contrary to Arabic expression. One does not find an example of this in the Arabic language. Other Ahādīth also clarify the purport of ‘there is no Nabī after me’, like in *Mishkāṭ* p.386 and *Sahīh Muslim* vol.1 p.446.

In these narrations, the word ‘*ba’d*’ is not found and every form of *Nubuwwat* has been negated, whether it is in agreement or in opposition.

As for the verse of *Sūrah Al-Jāthiya*, the answer is that the *mudāf ilayh* is hidden, (أى بعد كتاب الله).ⁱⁱ

ⁱ Kitāb-ul-Bariyyah p.184, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.13 pp.217-218

ⁱⁱ Khāzin, Ibn Jarīr, Kash-shāf

In the Hadīth speaking about the two liars, the *mudāf ilayh* is also hidden, i.e. after my *Nubuwwat*.ⁱ Another narration of *Sahīh Bukhārī* supports this. (الكذابين الذين أنا بينهما)

One liar appeared before the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, i.e. Aswad ‘Anasī and the second was after him, i.e. Musaylamah Kadh-dhāb. He was killed in the time of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ؓ.

Moreover, it is a historical reality that Musaylamah Kadh-dhāb did not make a claim against Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The *Adbān* that was called out in his area had the words ‘I testify that Muhammad is the Rasūl of Allāh’. Musaylamah Kadh-dhāb claimed that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was for the cities and he was for the outlying areas. He said, “We share the *Nubuwwat*.”ⁱⁱ

Answer 3:

In *Sahīh Muslim*, the words ‘*lā Nubuwwata ba’dī*’ come. This clearly shows that no-one will get *Nubuwwat* after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, there is no discussion of being in harmony or in opposition.

ⁱ Fath-ul-Bārī

ⁱⁱ Tārīkh Tabarī

OBJECTIONS UPON THE WORD ‘KHĀTAM’ & THE REPLIES

Objection 1:

The meaning of *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn* is that the *Ambiyā’* that have a *sharī’ah* have ended, not all *Ambiyā’*.

Answer 1:

This interpretation is refuted by the writings of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī.

1. The *lā* in ‘there is no Nabī after me’ is general.ⁱ
2. Do you not know that Allāh ﷻ the Merciful has made our Nabī ﷺ the *Khātam-ul-Ambiyā’* without any exception. Our Nabī ﷺ explained the meaning of *Khātam-un-Nabiyyīn* with the words ‘there is no Nabī after me’.ⁱⁱ
3. *Wahī* of *Risālat* has ended, but *Wilāyat*, *Imāmat* and *Khilāfat* will never end.ⁱⁱⁱ

Answer 2:

The Qādiyānīs only believe that *Zillī Burūzī Nubuwwat* continues, they accept that general *Nubuwwat* has

ⁱ Ayyām As-Sulh p.146

ⁱⁱ Hamāmat-ul-Bushrā p.20, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.7 p.200

ⁱⁱⁱ Tash-hīh Al-Adh-hān vol.1 p.1

ended. If, in this verse, *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn* means *Khātām-ur-Rusul*, then general *Nubuwwat*, which is independent *Nubuwwat* according to their terminology, which proof shows that it has ended? The proof that they use to show that independent *Nubuwwat* has ended, we use that very same proof to show that *Zillī Burūzī Nubuwwat* has no basis and is finished. Whatever your response is, that is what we shall give as an answer too.

Answer 3:

If the verse dealing with *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn* does not refer to all the *Ambiyā'*, but only the Rasūl, then the Qādiyānīs should inform us:

1. In the verse, (ولكن البر من آمن بالله واليوم الآخر والملائكة والكتاب والنبين), is it not necessary and binding to believe in all the *Ambiyā'*?
2. In the verse (فبعث الله النبيين مبشرين ومنذرين), do the Qādiyānīs say that Allāh ﷻ made some *Ambiyā'* as warners and bearers of glad-tidings and not others?
3. Does the verse (وإذ أخذ الله ميثاق النبيين) mean that Allāh ﷻ took a promise from some *Ambiyā'* and not others?

Objection 2:

The meaning of *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn* is *Afdal-un-Nabiyyīn*, just like the word *Khātām-ush-Shu'arā* is used

to show *Afdal-ush-Shu'arā*.

Answer 1:

In the following text, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has given the explanation of *Khātām* in the same way as the Muslims do.

1. 'A girl was born with me whose name was Jannat. At first, she came out from the stomach and then I came out. After me, there was no girl or boy born in the home of my parents. I was *Khātām-ul-Aulād* for them.'ⁱ
2. 'The *Khātām-ul-Ambiyā*' of the *Banī Isrā'īl* was 'Īsā.'ⁱⁱ
3. 'In the divine books, the promised Messiah has a few names. One is *Khātām-ul-Khulafā*', i.e. such a *Khalīfah* that will come last.'ⁱⁱⁱ
4. 'The Noble Qur'ān does not permit the coming of a Rasūl after *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn*, whether new or old.'^{iv}

Answer 2:

In the narration showing Sayyidunā 'Abbās رضي الله عنه being *Khātām-ul-Muhājirīn*, it is wrong to say that *Khātām*

ⁱ Tiryāq-ul-Qulūb p.379

ⁱⁱ Addendum Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah vol.5

ⁱⁱⁱ Chashma Ma'rifat p.318

^{iv} Izālat-ul-Auhām p.761

means *Afdal*. *Khātām* means last. This is because in *Al-Isābah*, Hāfiz Ibn Hajar رحمہ اللہ writes about Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضی اللہ عنہ, ‘He migrated a few days before the conquest of Makkah and he was present at the conquest of Makkah. After he migrated, no one else migrated. From this it is proven that *Khātām* means ‘last’, not ‘most virtuous’.

Objection 3:

The meaning of *Khātām* is ‘seal’, i.e. by the seal of Rasūlullāh ﷺ being placed, a person becomes a Nabī.

Answer 1:

The detailed reference on this has passed, i.e. the meaning of *Khātām-un-Nabiyyīn* is ‘that which ends off the chain of *Ambiyā*’.ⁱ

Answer 2:

The reference has passed above where Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī has written that he was *Khātām-ul-Aulād*. Do the Qādiyānīs tolerate in this text that the meaning of ‘seal’ be taken?

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Auhām p.614

Answer 3:

In *‘Asl Musaffā* vol.1 p.117, in the list of *Mujaddidīn*, the name of a *Mufassir* or *Muhaddith* should be presented that took the meaning of *Khātām* to be ‘one who places the seal’. Bring your proof if you are truthful.

BRIEF ANSWER TO THE STATEMENTS OF THE PIOUS

Sometimes the Qādiyānīs present the texts of Mullā ‘Alī Qārī رحمته and Shaykh Akbar رحمته. The summary of these texts according to the Qādiyānīs is that *Nubuwwat Tashrī’ī* is closed. The opposite of this according to Qādiyānī thought is that *Nubuwwat Ghayr Tashrī’ī* continues.

Answer:

According to Mirzā Mahmūd Qādiyānī, the belief of the Muslims was that *Nubuwwat* is only *Tashrī’ī*. See *Haqīqat-un-Nubuwwat* pp.122-123. So we say that according to Mirzā Mahmūd Qādiyānī, according to the people of Islām, there was only one *Nubuwwat*, i.e. *Tashrī’ī*. Hence, there was no *Nubuwwat* at all.

The text from *Haqīqat-un-Nubuwwat* is:

‘The definition of Nabī, in the light of which, you deny his *Nubuwwat* is that only he can be a Nabī who brings

a new *sharī'ah*, or, he abrogates some laws of a previous *sharī'ah*, or, he got *Nubuwwat* without a means and he does not follow another Nabī. This definition is generally accepted by the Muslims.'

The Qādiyānīs deceive by presenting these texts, wherein they say that they accept all *Ghayr Tashrī'i* forms of *Nubuwwat*. This is a complete accusation upon them. None of these pious personalities believed in *Zillī Burūzī Nubuwwat*. If we look at the context of their words, as well as their other writings, the meaning will become clear. It is necessary to study the book '*Aqīdat-ul-Ummat*' by 'Allāmah Khālīd Mahmūd ﷺ for the detailed responses.

A brief reply to these texts is that all those that have written these texts, they had the second coming of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ in mind. Therefore, they wrote that no Nabī with a new *sharī'ah* can come, but one who follows him can come. This can only mean Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ. This is because when he comes again, he will not bring any new *sharī'ah*, but he will follow the *sharī'ah* of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. In order to exclude Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ, such texts have been written. In some places, the name of Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ is mentioned and in some places it is not. The common Muslim is deceived by the general sense of the text. It is necessary to be aware of this.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NABĪ & RASŪL

There are many differences found in the definition of Nabī and Rasūl. Whichever definition is presented, there is some deficiency found or some objection is raised. The well-known definition is, Nabī is general and Rasūl is specific, i.e. a Rasūl is he who has been given a heavenly book and a Nabī is general. Some scholars give the definition of Rasūl as follows; a Rasūl is he who is sent to the disbelievers and a Nabī is general for all. According to Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, it is the opposite, i.e. Rasūl is general and Nabī is specific. Some scholars say that Nabī and Rasūl are synonymous and they are used interchangeably. This seems to be correct. No objection is raised on this one. In essence, Nabī and Rasūl are two qualities that refer to one person. Nabī is he who gets information of the unseen from Allāh ﷻ and Rasūl is he who conveys the laws and message of Allāh ﷻ to the people. When he is attributed to Allāh ﷻ, then he is called a Nabī and when he is linked to the people, he is called Rasūl. Therefore, in the light of this definition, every Nabī will be a Rasūl and vice-versa.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NABĪ & UMMATĪ

1. A Nabī is he who gets knowledge directly from Allāh ﷻ. The knowledge he gets is of the religious type. An *Ummatī* is he who acquires knowledge from the Nabī,

either through a means or without some means.

2. It is compulsory to accept the knowledge given by the Nabī, without raising any doubt or reservation. It is not compulsory upon others to accept the instruction or command given by an *Ummatī*. If he commands something in accordance to the Noble Qur’ān and *Sunnah*, then it will be compulsory to practice upon it because of it being from the Noble Qur’ān and *Sunnah*. If it goes against the Noble Qur’ān and *Sunnah*, it is worthy of rejection.

3. In terms of rejecting and accepting the Nabī, man is divided into two categories. One is the category that believes and they are called Muslims. The second are those who reject and are called *kāfir*, i.e. disbelievers.

No matter how great an *Ummatī* can become, these two groups will not apply for him, i.e. believers and disbelievers. Therefore, if someone says, “I get knowledge directly from Allāh ﷻ and it is obligatory upon others to believe and accept” (as is the claim of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī), then he will not remain an *Ummatī* because of this statement. Such a person will be said to be one who claims *Nubuwwat*. In accordance to the claims made by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī, he is a ‘Nabī’, not ‘*Ummatī*’. There is nothing in Islām like an ‘*Ummatī Nabī*’. This is deception from the Qādiyānīs. This is bringing together

two opposite things. If he is a Nabī, he is not an *Ummatī* and if he is an *Ummatī*, then he is not a Nabī. This is like saying a person is a man and a woman.

4. No matter how high an *Ummatī* goes, he can never be more virtuous than a Nabī. He who claims to be more virtuous than a Nabī, he will not remain an *Ummatī*. He will be said to be a person who claims *Nubuwwat* because some of the *Ambiyā'* are more virtuous than others. An *Ummatī* can never be more virtuous than a Nabī. Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī claims to be more virtuous than Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ in all qualities. In the light of the explanation given above, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī is a claimant of *Nubuwwat*. Based on these definitions, the Qādiyānī group accept him as a Nabī. The Lahorī group say that they do not accept him as a claimant of *Nubuwwat*. This is deception and fraud. In fact, this is a denial of Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and his teachings.

REASONS FOR THE KUFR OF THE QADIYĀNĪS

Why is Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī classified as a *kāfir* (disbeliever)? Why are his followers classified as disbelievers (*kuffār*)? If we search for the reasons, we shall find more than ten (10). We shall mention some of the important ones below.

1. Claim of *Nubuwwat* by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad

Qādiyānī

2. Denial of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ being born without a father
3. Denial of the ascension of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ and his descent before *Qiyāmah*
4. Insolence towards Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ and Sayyidah Maryam ﷺ
5. Insolence towards the rest of the *Ambiyā’*, including Rasūlullāh ﷺ
6. Denial of the Miracles of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ
7. Denial of the obligation of *Jihād*
8. *Takfīr* of all Muslims

FIRST REASON: CLAIM OF NUBUWWAT BY MIRZĀ

1. ‘Muhammad is the Rasūl of Allāh and those with him...’ In this verse, I have been named Muhammad and the Rasūl as well.’ⁱ
2. ‘I take an oath in the name of the deity that controls my life, He is the one that deputed me and He named

ⁱ Ek Ghaltī ka Izāla p.3, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.18 p.207

me a Nabī.ⁱ

3. ‘The true deity is He Who sent me as His Rasūl in Qādiyān.’ⁱⁱ

4. ‘Twenty-six (26) years ago, Allāh ﷻ named me as Muhammad and Ahmad in *Barābīn Ahmadiyyah* and He classified me as the *Burūz* of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.’ⁱⁱⁱ

5. ‘When the thirteenth century of the Hijrah ended, then Allāh commanded me and sent me at the start of the fourteenth century. All the *Ambiyā’*, from Ādam (ﷺ) to the last, all their names were kept for me and my last name is the promised ‘Īsā, Ahmad and Muhammad the appointed. I have been addressed with both names repeatedly. Both names have been used as Masīh and Mahdī.’^{iv}

6. ‘In order to prove that I have been deputed from Allāh ﷻ, He has shown so many proofs that even if they are divided amongst a thousand *Ambiyā’*, then even their *Nubuwwat* could be proven.’^v

ⁱ Tatimmah Haqīqat-ul-Wahī p.68, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.22 p.503

ⁱⁱ Dāfi’-ul-Balā’ p.11, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.18 p.231

ⁱⁱⁱ Tatimmah Haqīqat-ul-Wahī p.67, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.22 p.502

^{iv} Chashma Ma’rifat p.313, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.23 p.328

^v Chashma Ma’rifat p.317, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.23 p.332

SECOND REASON: DENIAL OF THE BIRTH OF SAYYIDUNĀ ‘ĪSĀ ﷺ WITHOUT A FATHER

1. ‘The one who says to me that I do not respect Masīh Ibn Maryam (ﷺ) is a corrupter and fabricator. Masīh is Masīh. I respect his four (4) brothers because all five were from the same mother. Not only this, I also state that the two (2) of his sisters are noble. All of them were born from the noble belly of Maryam the Chaste. Maryam (ﷺ) was such that she married unmarried for some time. Then the pious elders of the nation insisted that she get married as she was pregnant.’ⁱ
2. ‘Sayyidunā Masīh Ibn Maryam (ﷺ) worked as a carpenter together with his father Yūsuf for twenty-two (22) years.’ⁱⁱ
3. ‘Yasū’ Masīh had four (4) brothers and two (2) sisters. All of them were the real biological brothers and sisters of Yasū’, i.e. all were the children of Yūsuf and Maryam.’ⁱⁱⁱ
4. ‘Due to his activities, his brother became very angry. He had conviction that his mind was negatively affected. He had always desired that he be treated properly in

ⁱ Kashtī Nūh p.16, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.19 p.18

ⁱⁱ Izālat-ul-Auhām p.303, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.3 pp.254-255

ⁱⁱⁱ Kashtī Nūh p.16, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.19 p.18

some hospital, probably Allāh ﷻ would cure him.’ⁱ

THIRD REASON: DENIAL OF THE ASCENSION AND DESCENT OF SAYYIDUNĀ ‘ĪSĀ ﷺ

1. ‘To say that Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ did not pass away is a great form of polytheism. It is something that eats good deeds and goes against logic.’ⁱⁱ
2. ‘After this, their Masīh fled quietly and came to Kashmir. He passed away there. You have heard that his grave is in Srinagar, Khanyar.’ⁱⁱⁱ
3. ‘Until Allāh did not turn His attention to this and He did not explain repeatedly, ‘You are the Masīh and ‘Īsā (ﷺ) has passed away’, until then I had the same belief that you had. It is because of this, out of complete humility I had written of the second coming of Masīh in *Barāhīn*. When Allāh revealed the reality to me, I abandoned that belief.’^{iv}
4. ‘Sayyidunā ‘Īsā (ﷺ) passed away. The beliefs of him being alive, going to the heavens and being alive to this day with his body and coming to the earth are all

ⁱ Addendum to Anjām Ātham p.6, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.11 p.290

ⁱⁱ Addendum to Haqīqat-ul-Wahī p.39, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.22 p.660

ⁱⁱⁱ Kashtī Nūh p.53, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.19 pp.57-58

^{iv} I’jāz Ahmādī p.6, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.19 p.113

accusations upon him.”ⁱ

FOURTH REASON: INSOLENT TOWARDS SAYYIDUNĀ ‘ĪSĀ ﷺ & SAYYIDAH MARYAM ﷺ

1. ‘Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ did not practice upon good character...he went so far ahead in terms of lewd speech that he used to refer to the pious Jewish elders as bastards. In every lecture, he used to swear the Jewish scholars very badly and refer to them with very bad names.’ⁱⁱ

2. ‘He was simply a weak human being. He had a full share of all human weaknesses. He had four biological brothers and some of them were opposed to him. He had two biological sisters. He was a weak person that fell unconscious on the cross just by two pegs being knocked.’ⁱⁱⁱ

3. ‘There is no special power established in him that is not found in other *Ambiyā’*. In fact, other *Ambiyā’* were greater than him in displaying miracles. His weaknesses testify that he was just a human.’^{iv}

ⁱ Addendum to Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah vol.5 p.230, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.21 p.406

ⁱⁱ Chashma Masīhī p.11, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.20 p.346

ⁱⁱⁱ Tadhkirah Ash-Shahādatayn p.23, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.20 p.25

^{iv} Lecture Siyalkot p.43, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.20 p.235

4. 'I do not ever see 'Īsā (ﷺ) as superior to me in these matters, i.e. just as revelation comes to him, it comes to me. Just as miracles are ascribed to him, I see myself with certainty that I am referred to by the miracles. In fact, to a greater degree than him.'ⁱ

5. 'Look, what a great objection it is that Maryam (ﷺ) was given over for worship at the temple. She was to serve as a permanent attendant at *Bayt-ul-Muqaddas* and not marry her entire life. However, when it was seen that she is about six (6) to seven (7) months pregnant, then the seniors of the nation got her married to a carpenter by the name of Yūsuf. A month or two after going to his house, Maryam (ﷺ) delivered a boy. He was named 'Īsā or Yasū'.ⁱⁱ

6. 'During the rainy season, thousands of insects are created on their own. Even Sayyidunā Ādam (ﷺ) was born without a father, so the birth of Sayyidunā 'Īsā (ﷺ) in this way does not prove any special status. In fact, being born without a father points out that a person was deprived of some power and strength.'ⁱⁱⁱ

7. 'Sayyidunā 'Īsā (ﷺ) used to drink. It was probably

ⁱ Chashma Masīhī p.23, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.20 p.354

ⁱⁱ Chashma Masīhī p.26, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.20 p.355

ⁱⁱⁱ Chashma Masīhī pp.27-28, Rūhānī Khazā' in vol.20 p.356

because of some illness or because of an old habit.’ⁱ

8. ‘His family was very pure and clean. Three of his grandfathers and grandmothers were adulterers and prostitutes. It is through their blood that he came into existence.’ⁱⁱ

FIFTH REASON: INSOLENT TOWARDS THE REST OF THE AMBIYĀ’, INCLUDING RASŪLULLĀH ﷺ

1. ‘In order to hide Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Allāh ﷻ selected such a disgraced place, it emitted a stench, it was cramped and dark and it was a place of filth for the insects.’ⁱⁱⁱ

2. ‘Then, in this very same book, the following revelation of Allāh is mentioned not far from the conversation, ‘Muhammad is the Rasūl of Allāh, and those with him are severe upon the disbelievers, merciful amongst themselves’, in this revelation, my name has been kept as Muhammad and as the Rasūl.’^{iv}

ⁱ Kashtī Nūh p.65, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.19 p.71 (footnote)

ⁱⁱ Addendum to Anjām Ātham p.7 (footnote), Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.11 p.291

ⁱⁱⁱ Tuhfah Golrawiyya, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.17 p.205

^{iv} Ek Ghaltī ka Izalah p.4, Rūhānī Khazā’ in vol.18 p.207

3. ‘I am Ādam, I am Nūh, I am Dāwūd, I am ‘Īsā Ibn Maryam, I am Muhammad ﷺ.’ⁱ

4. ‘Every Nabī was given perfections in accordance to his ability and work. Some were given many and some were given less. However, the promised Masīh (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) got *Nubuwwat* when he acquired all the perfections of the *Muhammadī Nubuwwat* and he became worthy of being referred to as a ‘*Zillī Nabī*’. The *Zillī Nubuwwat* did not move the feet of the promised *Masīh* backwards, but it pushed them forward. His feet went so much ahead that it brought him to stand side-by-side with Rasūlullāh ﷺ.’ⁱⁱ

5. ‘There was a lunar eclipse as a sign for him (Rasūlullāh ﷺ) and for me; there was a solar and a lunar eclipse. Now what will you deny?’ⁱⁱⁱ

6. ‘It is totally correct that every person can progress and reach the highest of ranks, to the extent that he can go beyond the rank of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.’^{iv}

7. ‘Allāh ﷻ showed me so many signs that if they had

ⁱ Tatimmah Haqīqat-ul-Wahī p.521, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.22 p.521

ⁱⁱ Kalimat-ul-Fasl p.113 (Mirzā Bashīr Ahmad MA)

ⁱⁱⁱ I’jāz Ahmādī p.71, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.19 p.183

^{iv} Mirzā Mahmūd ki Diary, Akhbār-ul-Fadl Qādiyān no.5 vol.10 (17 July 1922)

to be shown during the time of Nūh ﷺ, the people would not have drowned.’ⁱ

8. ‘The Yūsuf of this *Ummah*, i.e. this lowly one (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī) is greater than the Isrā’īlī Yūsuf because he made *du’ā* for jail and was saved from jail, but Yūsuf Ibn Ya’qūb (ﷺ) was put into jail.’ⁱⁱ

9. ‘Is this not a great level of shamelessness that where we include Dāwūd ﷺ, Sulaymān ﷺ, Zakariyya ﷺ and Yahyā ﷺ as part of the verse ‘we do not differentiate between any of the messengers’, but a great Nabī like the promised *Mahdī* has been left out.’ⁱⁱⁱ

10. ‘Although there were many *Ambiyā*’ in the world, I am not lower than any of them in terms of recognition. Whatever vessel Allāh gave to each Nabī, He gave the collection of them all to me. Due to my coming, every Nabī became alive; every Rasūl is hidden in my garment. I have conviction upon my revelation and I am not any lower in comparison to any Nabī in this conviction. Whoever speaks lies is accursed.’^{iv}

ⁱ Tatimmah Haqīqat-ul-Wahī p.137, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.22 p.575

ⁱⁱ Barāhīn Ahmadiyyah vol.5 p.99, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.21 p.99

ⁱⁱⁱ Kalimat-ul-Fasl p.117 (Mirzā Bashīr Ahmad MA)

^{iv} Nuzūl-ul-Masīh p.100, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.18 pp.477-478

**SIXTH REASON: DENIAL OF THE MIRACLES
OF SAYYIDUNĀ ‘ĪSĀ ﷺ**

1. ‘The Christians have written of many of his miracles, but the truth is that there was no miracle that came from him.’ⁱ
2. ‘The miracles of *Masīh* are rendered void because of the pond that was a spot of unique things even before the birth of *Masīh*. All types of patients and all those suffering from leprosy, paralysis etc. would dive into this pond and would be cured.’ⁱⁱ
3. ‘In brief, the belief is totally wrong and is based on polytheistic thought that *Masīh* would make birds out of clay, and then blow into them, after which they would become real. It was simply an action on the soil that would develop through the power of the soul.’ⁱⁱⁱ
4. ‘The Noble Qur’ān is full of metaphors, that is why one can give the meaning of these verses in spiritual terms where birds of clay refer to the illiterate and ignorant people that ‘Īsā ﷺ made his friends. It is as though he brought them into his company, drew the sketch of birds, and then blew the soul of guidance into

ⁱ Addendum to Anjām Ātham p.6, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.11 p.290

ⁱⁱ Izālat-ul-Auhām, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.263

ⁱⁱⁱ Ibid

them. Through this, they began to move.’ⁱ

5. ‘It is nothing surprising that Allāh ﷻ informed *Masīh* through logical means of some toy that could be made to move by blowing it and it would seem as though the bird moves for real. Alternatively, if it does not move, then it walks with its legs. This is because Masīh Ibn Maryam (ﷺ) did the work of carpentry with his father Yūsuf for twenty-two (22) years. It is quite clear that carpentry is such a work wherein different things are made and the mind is sharpened through making different things.’ⁱⁱ

6. ‘It is possible that *Masīh* would bring soil in which the effect of *Rūb Al-Qudus* was apparent from the pond for such work. Anyway, this miracle (making the form of birds and causing them to fly) was a type of play.’ⁱⁱⁱ

SEVENTH REASON: DENIAL OF THE OBLIGATION OF JIHĀD

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “*Jihād* will continue until the Day of *Qiyāmah*.” This means that as long as oppressive and tyrannical powers remain in the world, *Jihād* will continue. After the descent of Sayyidunā ‘Īsā ﷺ all

ⁱ Izālat-ul-Auhām p.177, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.255

ⁱⁱ Izālat-ul-Auhām footnote p.126, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.254

ⁱⁱⁱ Izālat-ul-Auhām p.135, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.3 p.263

tyrannical and false powers will be finished off. After this, *Jihād* will also come to an end. This is because *Jihād* is waged against the people of falsehood, and at that time, the disbelievers will be finished off.

Upon the indication of the British, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī had announced the prohibition of *Jihād* in order to extinguish the enthusiasm for *Jihād* from the Muslims. This is blasphemy, i.e. *Kufr*.

Study some of the texts below:

1. 'From today, it has been forbidden to fight for religion (*Dīn*). After this, whoever raises the sword for religion, takes the name of a *ghāzī* and kills the disbelievers, he is disobedient to Allāh and His Rasūl.'ⁱ
2. 'I am convinced that as my disciples grow; those who believe in *Jihād* will decrease proportionately. This is because believing in me to be the *Masīh* and the *Mahdī* is denial of *Jihād*.'ⁱⁱ
3. 'My religion, that I have repeatedly shown, is that Islām has two parts. One is to obey Allāh ﷻ and the second is to obey the government that has established peace, the government that has given us place in its shade from the oppressors. That government is the

ⁱ Khutbah Ilhāmiyyah p.17, Rūhanī Khazā'in vol.16 p.17

ⁱⁱ Majmū'ah Ishtihārāt vol.3 p.19

British government.’ⁱ

4. ‘Now abandon *Jihād* O friends, it is now forbidden to think of war and killing for the sake of religion






Masīh, the leader of religion has now come; the end of all religious war has come

Now the light of the Lord has come from the heaven, the verdict of war and *Jihād* is now useless

The one who now wages *Jihād* is the enemy, he denies the Nabī if he has this belief.’ⁱⁱ

EIGHTH REASON: TAKFĪR OF ALL MUSLIMS

1. ‘Whoever opposed me, he has been named a Christian, Jew and polytheist.’ⁱⁱⁱ

2. ‘Whoever believes in Mūsā  but not ‘Īsā , or he believes in ‘Īsā  but not Muhammad  or he believes in Muhammad  but not the promised *Masīh*, he is not only a disbeliever, but a thorough disbeliever and is out of the fold of Islām.’^{iv}

3. ‘I have been given the following glad-tidings:

ⁱ Shahādat-ul-Qur’ān p.84, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.6 p.380

ⁱⁱ Addendum to Tuhfah Golrawiyyah p.42, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.17 p.77

ⁱⁱⁱ Nuzūlul-Masīh p.4, Rūhānī Khazā’in vol.18 p.382

^{iv} Kalimat-ul-Fasl p.110 by Mirzā Bashīr Ahmad MA

‘whoever has enmity for you after recognizing you and adopts opposition for you, he is a *Jahannamī*.’ⁱ

4. ‘Allāh ﷻ has shown to me that to whoever my call reaches and he does not accept me, he is not a Muslim.’ⁱⁱ

5. ‘All the Muslims that were not included in the pledge at the hands of the promised Masīh (Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī), whether they heard his name or not, they are disbelievers and out of the fold of Islām.’ⁱⁱⁱ



ⁱ Tadhkirah p.168, Second Edition

ⁱⁱ Tadhkirah p.600, Second Edition

ⁱⁱⁱ Ā’inah Sadāqat p.35, by Mirzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Mahmūd

CONCLUSION | خاتمة

By the grace of Allāh ﷻ, the post mortem of the accursed liar, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad Qādiyānī and his false *Nubuwwat* is complete. The veil covering their deception has been ripped open. Through the grace of Allāh ﷻ, we have prepared the package to refute Qādiyānism for the debaters, *Inshā Allāh*, they will not be defeated from any angle. It will help them at every angle and sphere.

There is a great need for the Muslims and heirs of Rasūlullāh ﷺ to turn their attention towards this topic. They must take benefit from this work, deal with the Qādiyānīs in every way, from every angle and prove their love for Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the value they have for their faith.

May Allāh ﷻ grant us the ability to work in the field of the protection of the belief of *Khatm-e-Nubuwwat* and may He raise us amongst the servants of Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the hereafter. May Allāh ﷻ make this work into a means of guidance for humanity. Amīn

ربنا تقبل منا إنك أنت السميع العليم ولا تنزع قلوبنا بعد إذ هديتنا وهب لنا
من لدنك رحمة إنك أنت الوهاب ، وصلى الله على النبي الكريم وعلى آله
وصحبه وعلى من تبعهم إلى يوم الدين.

ﷺ

SUGGESTED READING

1. Shahādat-ul-Qur’ān, Maulānā Muhammad Ibrāhīm Siyālkotī
2. Taudīh-ul-Kalām fī Ihbāt ‘Īsā, Maulānā Nizām-ud-Dīn Kohātī
3. Kalimat-ullāh fī Hayāt Rūhullāh, Maulānā Muhammad Idrīs Kāndehlawī
4. Sayf Chishtiyyā’ī, Pīr Muhr ‘Alī Shah Golrawī
5. ‘Aqīdat-ul-Islām fī Hayāt ‘Īsā, Maulānā Sayyed Muhammad Anwar Shah Kashmīrī
6. Al-‘Ibrah An-Nāzirah fī Nuzūl ‘Īsā Qabl Al-Akhirah, ‘Allāmah Muhammad Zāhid Al-Kautharī
7. Nuzūl ‘Īsā, Maulānā Muhammad Badr-e-‘Alam Mīrthī
8. At-Tasrīh bimā Tawātara fī Nuzūl Al-Masīh, ‘Allāmah Anwar Shah Kashmīrī
9. Khatm-e-Nubuwwat, Muftī Muhammad Shafī
10. An-Nabī Al-Khātam, Maulānā Manāzir Ahsan Gīlānī
11. Khatm-e-Nubuwwat, Maulānā Muhammad Ishāq Sindehlawī

12. 'Aqīdat-ul-Ummat fī Ma'na Khatm-e-Nubuwwat, 'Allāmah Khālīd Mahmūd
13. Tārīkh Muhāsabah Qādiyāniyyat
14. 'Aqīdah Khatm-e-Nubuwwat aur Salaf-e-Sālihīn, Maulānā Muhammad Nāfi'
15. Qādiyānī Madh-hab, Professor Muhammad Ilyās Barnī
16. Qādiyānī Qawl wa Fi'l, Professors Muhammad Ilyās Barnī
17. Kitāb Ra'īs Qādiyān, Maulānā Muhammad Rafīq Dilāwarī
18. Al-Kāwiyah 'alāl Ghāwiyah, Maulānā Muhammad 'Alam
19. Harf Muhrimānah, Professor Ghulām Jilānī
20. Qādiyāniyyat, Maulānā Sayyed Abul-Hasan 'Alī Nadwī ﷺ
21. Islām aur Mirzā'iyyat, Ihsān Ilāhī Zahīr
22. Muhammadī Pocket Book, Response to Ahmadiyyah Pocket Book, Maulānā 'Abdullāh Mi'mār
23. Khatm-e-Nubuwwat, Islām aur Qādiyāniyyat, Maulānā 'Abdul Ghanī Patyālwi
24. Fātih Qādiyān, Maulānā Thanā-ullāh Amritsarī

25. Chirāgh-e-Hidāyat, Maulānā Muhammad Chirāgh
26. Harf-e-Iqbāl
27. Rū'edād Muqaddamah Bahāwalpūr
28. Qādiyānī Nubuwwat, Maulānā 'Atīq-ur-Rahmān Tā'ib
29. Qādiyānī Fitnah, Maulānā 'Atīq-ur-Rahmān Tā'ib



WEBSITES

1. www.khatm-e-nubuwwat.org
2. www.nubuwwat.org
3. www.thecult.info
4. www.irshad.org

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

By the grace of Allah ﷻ, translation completed on Tuesday 15 Rajab 1441/10 March 2020. All praise is due to Allah ﷻ for blessing us with the opportunity to translate this work. May Allāh ﷻ accept from the author and translator and take this work worldwide for the guidance of humanity, Āmīn.

As with all endeavors, there are bound to be perfections and shortcomings. The perfections are from Allāh ﷻ and the shortcomings from us. Constructive feedback can be forwarded to ghazali.in.motion@gmail.com

عبد الله ملا

Abdullah Moolla, Azaadville

رَبَّنَا تَقَبَّلْ مِنَّا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ السَّمِيعُ الْعَلِيمُ

*O our Rabb, accept from us, indeed You are All-Hearing,
All-Knowing*

